




Brit
433 7

Howden



BIBLIOTHECA
REGIA
MONACENSIS.

THE NATIONAL LETTER

THE NATIONAL LETTER

THE NATIONAL LETTER

FIVE ADDRESSES ON LETTER

THE NATIONAL LETTER

THE NATIONAL LETTER

AN
HISTORICAL LETTER

TO

THE REV. CHARLES O'CONOR, D. D.

HERETOFORE STYLING HIMSELF

COLUMBANUS:

UPON HIS

FIVE ADDRESSES OR LETTERS

TO

HIS COUNTRYMEN.

FROM

FRANCIS PLOWDEN, ESQ.

Hunc tu Romane Caveto.—HOR.

Irishmen beware.—2 Col. p. 5.

Englishmen beware.—5 Col. p. 123.

Not yet Published,

1812.

BRITISH MUSEUM

HISTORICAL LETTERS

TO

THE REV. CHAS. O'CONNOR, D.D.

COLUMBANAUS

FIVE ADDRESSES OF LETTERS

Bayerische
Staatsbibliothek
München

A TABLE

OF

CONTENTS.

PREFACE.—Cause of the Publication, I.—Doctor O'Connor's Charges against the Author, II to VII.—The Author lays claim to honor and honesty, VIII.—His views and motives in printing this Letter, VIII.—Duties of the Historian and Liberty of the Press, X.—

Effects of a Free Press, 1.—The field of history common to all, 2.—Historians cannot always go into full evidence, 3.—Every Author opens a correspondence with all mankind, 5.—Pompous and irrelevant arrogation of truth by Columbanus, Note from 5 to 8.—Circumstances, under which the Author undertook the Historical Review, 9.—First Letter from Doctor M'Dermott to the Author, and who he is, Note 10 to 12.—Doctor M'Dermott's opinion of the Historical Review, 13.—The Author's Postliminous Preface, and Grattan's opinion of the Historical Review, Note, 14, 15.—Doctor O'Connor's suppressed Volume of Irish History, and at whose instigation, 15, 16.—Lord Buckingham's back stairs manœuvre at Saint James's, 16. Grattan's Portrait of the Marquis of Buckingham, 17.—Letter from Doctor M'Dermott giving an account of his Grandfather's Works, 28, 29.—Author's First Letter to Columbanus, 21.—Doctor Chas. O'Connor's First Letter to the Author, 21 to 25.—The Author not discouraged by menace or refusal, 25.—The Author's Second Letter to Doctor O'Connor, 26 to 28.—Doctor O'Connor's reply and last Letter to the Author, 28 to 32.—Doctor M'Dermott's Letter to the Author upon his Correspondence with Doctor O'Connor, 33 to 35.—Two further inter-

esting Letters from Doctor M'Dermott to the Author, 36 to 39.
 —Author's last Letter to Doctor M'Dermott, 40, 41.—Doctor
 O'Connor's *Prospectus* in Dodesley's Annual Register for 1803,
 reprinted in 1805, 41.—His long anticipated views of becom-
 ing a public man, 43.—His poetical allusions retorted upon
 himself, 44, 5, 6.—Why Doctor O'Connor was noticed in the
 Author's Dissertation upon the Antiquity of Irish History, 46.
 He is assimilated to Sir Richard Musgrave, 49.—Proofs, that
 Doctor O'Connor was the Author of the Review of his own in-
 tended work in Dodesley, 53.—Transfer of the O'Connor Col-
 lection from Belenagare to Stowe, 54.—Proofs of the Sale of
 the Collection to the Marquis of Buckingham, 59.—Further
 Proofs of Doctor O'Connor's being the Author of the *Prospectus*
 or Review in Dodesley, 65.—General nature of Columbanus's
 mission to divide his Countrymen, 72.—Spirit of Ormond's
 days, 74.—Columbanus's incoherency in praising his heroes, 76
 Ormond's conduct, as represented by the Author, proved from
 Protestant Authors, 81.—Ormond's reluctance to obey the
 King's commands, 82.—The King's wishes for peace thwarted
 by Ormond, 84.—Columbanus affects candour about Ormond,
 86.—Ormond justifies cruelties, and criminales those, whom he
 believes innocent, 90.—Cruel and sanguinary conduct of Or-
 mond, 93.—His spirit of intrigue, 99 —Confesses his own in-
 sincerity, 103.—Boasts of his Machiavelism, Ibid.—His mis-
 conduct to the Catholics proved from the highest Protestant au-
 thority, 105.—Corresponds with Galbraith, and favours the
 Scotch Covenanters, 107.—Admits the Loyalty of the Catholics
 when too late, 108.—Lord Digby's evidence, that Charles I.
 letter from Newcastle against the peace was either forced or
 forged, 109.—Ormond favours the Parliamentarians, and is in
 their power, 110.—He treacherously excludes the Catholics
 from place, 111.—Columbanus called upon for a full and more
 correct portrait of Ormond, 115.—Columbanus wishes for a
 Bishoprick, 118.—The Author apologizes for his own, and
 charges Columbanus with grosser anachronisms, Note, 120.—

Canvas for the See of Elphin for Doctor O'Connor, 119.—Columbanus dedicates his Fifth Address to the Marquis of Buckingham, panegyricizes Mr. Butler, attempts to implicate the English Catholics in his views, denies, that he recommends the taking of the Oath of Supremacy; his gross infidelity and deception herein. Note, 127 to 136.—Indecently attacks his own Hierarchy, 137.—A comparison of the sentiments of the virtuous Charles O'Connor the Grandfather, with those of Columbanus. Note, 138, 9.—A triumvirate of bold men, (Walsh, Berrington, and O'Connor) who recommend to the Catholics to take the Oath of Supremacy. Note, 46 to 51.—Columbanus's antipapacy, 151. Practical illustration of the necessity of maintaining the orthodox doctrine concerning spiritual jurisdiction in a case before Baron M'Cleland at the Fermanagh Assizes. Note, 154 to 160.—Columbanus's antipathy to Rome broke out subsequently to the canvas for Elphin, 160.—He shamefully misrepresents the *Civil Constitution* of the Gallican Clergy, and the Synodical Resolutions of the Irish Bishops at Tullow, 162.—State and case of the French Emigrant Clergy, and the *Civil Constitution*, 163.—Jansenistical antipathy against the See of Rome, 167.—Some account of Quesnell, with whom Columbanus so warmly sympathizes; and instances of his Historical infidelity. Note, 168, 169.—He grossly misrepresents the Synod of the English Vicars Apostolic, 171.—As he does the National Catholic Synod of Tullow, 175.—He basely attempts to fix all the Catholic Clergy of Ireland with perjury, 179.—He misrepresents Doctor Milner and the Declaration of the Gallican Clergy concerning Ecclesiastical power, 182.—Insidious malice of Columbanus in mangling and pressing the adoption of the Gallican Declaration, 198.—His excessive antipapacy, 205.—State intrigue against the religion of Ireland, 209.—Columbanus traduces his country and her religion, 211.—Columbanus's further arguments against submission to the Pope, 223.—His gross flattery of the English, 226.—Attempts to revile the religion of his countrymen by the deistical sneer of a foreign'offi-

cer, 227.—History of, and reflections upon, Columbanus's smothering the Memoirs of his Grandfather and the History of Ireland in the Poddle : and a further antithesis of Grandfather and Grandson, 229.—Columbanus abuses his Hierarchy, 243. His visionary effects of Veto, and wild attempts to engage some Statesmen to support it, 245.—The real nature of *Veto* seen and disclaimed by Lords Grey and Grenville, and Messrs. Ponsonby and Grattan, 247.—Reflections upon the Fifth Resolution of the Board of English Catholics, Note, 249, 250.—What the Author published concerning the Supremacy of the Bishop of Rome in his Church and State, 255. Confusion of Columbanus's ideas of Order and jurisdiction, 257.—Columbanus fathers assertions on Doctor Poynter, which he never made ; and what conduct sincere Catholics expect from Doctor Poynter now he is the spiritual superior of Columbanus, Note, 260 to 265. The common law of England recognized the uncontrollable right in the Pope to appoint and confirm Bishops, illustrated by old cases, Note, 266 to 270.—Nature of the acts collating spiritual power, upon which Columbanus is lamentably confused, 270.—Rev. Mr. Joseph Berrington's representation of Jansenism, Note, 276 to 279.—Erroneous practical ideas of Englishmen concerning the King's Supremacy, 279.—Their real fundamental doctrines upon the *power of the keys*, and the consequent acts of election, institution, order, and jurisdiction, 284. Columbanus's arrogant assumptions, ignorant aberrations, and insidious attempts to mislead his countrymen about nomination, confirmation, and negative of the civil power, 288.—His false doctrines about Papal Supremacy, and (in note) his misrepresentation of Grotius and Melancton upon the necessity of a supreme head to the church, 294.—He practices fraud upon his countrymen by suppressing known truths, 300.—Jurisdictional authority of the Pope proved in the 4th century from St. Athanasius and others, 303.—Columbanus confutes himself, 308.—(Note) the special mission of the seventy-two disciples, (Luke ch. x.) 310...Columbanus takes unfair advantage of Fleury the

Ecclesiastical Historian, 312.... Fleury contradicts Columbanus on Papal Jurisdiction, 315.... Further errors of Columbanus about Papal Jurisdiction and the Hierarchy, 319.... (Note) Singular contrast of Columbanus and his Grandfather, 323.... (Note) the canvas for Elphin elucidated by the application of the Mother of the Sons of Zebedee, 328.... Columbanus's trick in professing his submission to the Pope in Latin and in English, 330.... He misrepresents the system of Coadjutorships, 333. His motives for opposing Coadjutorships, 336.... (A very interesting Note) Singular conduct of Sir John Cox Hippenesley from his Embassy to the court of Rome, down to his heading the Vetoists, and his singular speech in the House of Commons on the 22d June, 1812. How played upon by his correspondents from Ireland in 1796, and by Columbanus and Mr. Butler, in 1812, from 338 to 355.... Diocesan Election or Postulation not absolutely necessary for the real appointment of Bishops by the Pope, 341.... Bishoprics not devisable as asserted by Columbanus, 357.... Appointment of Coadjutors discretionary in the Pope, 358.... Indispensible duties of the Pope in providing Bishops for the dispersed churches, 360.... (Note) Authority of Thomassin and others for Coadjutorships in the very earliest days of Christianity, even under St. Peter, 362. Instances, which call upon the Pope to appoint Coadjutors, 366. The qualifications requisite for a Bishop according to St. Paul, 367.

APPENDIX.

NO. I. Lands granted to the Duke of Ormond by the Act of Settlement and Court of Claims, 1 to 2.... No. II. The Oath of Allegiance framed and proposed by James, 1 to 3. The oath prescribed for the British Catholics by the 39th Geo. III. p. 4. The Oath and Declaration, by which Roman Catholics become entitled to the benefits of the 33d Geo. III. Irish Statute, 5.... No. III. Proofs of the assimilation of Father Peter Walsh and the Rev. Doctor Charles O'Connor asserted in the note, p. 818. of the 3d Vol. of the History of Ireland since the Union, from 7 to 52, interspersed with reflections and illustrations. Form of the Oath for serving the Irish mission, taken by Doctor O'Connor, 8. Something of the degree of a Ludovisian Alumnus or Free Scholar, by Papal bounty, 9. Similar relations between Columbanus and Dodesley, as between Doctor Milner and Coyne, 12. Queries put to Doctor Bodkin by Columbanus and to Columbanus by the Author, concerning costs of suits at

Rome, 18. Growth and mischief of Jansenism; and some particulars of their origin, spirit, doctrines, policy, zeal, and characteristics, with some account of Richer, Launois, Quesnel, Dupin, and other Jansenistical leaders. Walsh calls Richer *truly Catholic and learned*, and Doctor O'Connor terms the others first-rate French Catholic theologians, 28 to 48. Dr. O'Connor's rapid progress into consequence; and specimens of his sublime eloquence, 48 to 52.....No. IV. Proofs of the truth and applicability of the Author's suggestion in the before-mentioned note, p. 820, that Mr. Butler author of the blue books, and Dr. O'Connor are *duo laborantes in Unum*; consisting of interesting extracts from the blue books, and particularly the protest of the Committee of *would-be protesting Catholic Dissenters against their Bishops*, and observations thereon published by the Author in his *Case Stated* in 1791, 52 to 82....No. V. Doctor O'Connor's mutilated and distorted copy of the Declaration of the Gallican Clergy, in 1682. Then a true copy of the original in Latin, and a very literal translation of it into English, and some observations upon it by the Author, 82 to 90.....No. VI. Synodical Resolutions of Tullow; or Declaration of the Roman Catholic Prelates of Ireland concerning certain opinions lately published in England, 90 to 94....No. VII. Rev. Dr. O'Connor's different professions of submission to Papal authority, in Latin and English with observations upon the gross infidelity of the translation, and his views in mistranslating it, 95 to 99. No. VIII. A Letter from the Archbishop of Baltimore and his four Suffragan Bishops in the United States of North America, to the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, translated from the Latin, 99. Address of the new American Hierarchy to their flocks concerning the present state of the Pope, 102. Extract of an Original Letter from the most Rev. Doctor Carroll to the most Rev. Doctor Troy, 106. Ditto from the Right Rev. J. O. Plessis, Bishop of Quebec, to the most Rev. Doctor Troy, 107. (Note) about that Prelate's appointment to the See of Quebec, after Father Kildea had been encouraged to expect it, 107, 8, 9. Pastoral of the Bishop of Quebec for prayers, &c. on the captivity of the Pope, 109....No. IX. The Irish Remonstrance to the King, signed by Peter Walsh and 22 other Regulars in 1666, p. 114,....No. X. A Bull of Pope Ganganelli appointing a Coadjutor to the See of Waterford from the original in the Author's possession translated from the Latin, 118. Sir John Cox Hipposley's account of the change introduced into the consecration Oath. (Note) 123 to 125.

PREFACE

PREFACE.

TO THE READER.

FROM every unbiassed reader of my several publications concerning Ireland, I claim credit for having intended to act up strictly to my motto, *in-corrupta fides nudaque veritas*. In such of the critiques and censures upon any of those works, as have come under my eyes, two persons only have charged me with falsehood. Sir Richard Musgrave has anonymously indulged his native, acquired or purchased antipathy in the *British Critic*, the *Anti-Jacobin*, and a work comprizing the substance of the two former, called *Strictures upon Plowden's Historical Review of the State of Ireland*. To that stipendiary scavenger of slanderous untruths, I addressed in 1805, *An Historical Letter*, printed and published both in London and Dublin, in which I fixt him with each

Cause of
this Pub-
lication.

A

of

of those anonymous effusions of bile against the Author of the *Historical Review*, the nation, which was the subject of that Work, and the religion professed by the generality of that Nation. I brought home to his pen the nauseating adulation of the Baronet's own productions, & hope, I failed not in exposing some out of the numerous untruths, calumnies and inconsistencies, with which he superabounds. I confidently assert, that each of his charges of falsehood has been successfully refuted by conclusive evidence, or the exposure of the Baronet's gross misquotations of authorities. No reply has been hitherto made to that letter. In writing it I intended to perform an important duty to Ireland and myself. The next gentleman, who has in print charged me with having falsified any part of Irish History, is the Rev. Charles O'Connor, D.D. under the assumed name of *Columbanus*; he has assailed me most ferociously in the 2nd of his printed letters to his countrymen.

Dr. O'Connor's
several
charges against the
letter Writer.

The following passages from Dr. O'Connor's late writings* are brought together to shew the reader the necessity I am under of repelling the aggression, his learned Reverence has thought fit to open upon me.† “I have read Ormond's History not only in

* *Columbanus ad Hybernos* No. 2, or a second letter with Part I, of an Historical Address on the calamities occasioned by *foreign influence* in the nomination of Bishops to Irish Sees, by the Rev. C. O'Connor D.D. Seeley Buckingham 1810.

† Page 221, 2, 3.

in the superficial and declamatory pages of modern compilers, who follow each other, gagging in one and the same note, like the wild Geese in our native bogs, but also in the fragments, that remain of our own original Catholic Writers, who had the honor of being personally acquainted with him: and I boldly assert, that never was the character of any man more injured, or more misrepresented, than Ormond's is by Mr. Plowden. I do not mean, that Mr. Plowden is guilty of the flagitious crime of misrepresentation: but I have a right to complain, that he suffered himself to be misguided by the foreign influence men, the *Castabals* of our native country: for long before he published I warned him against them. I cautioned him by a letter, so far back as February 1805, against trusting to those very partial and suspicious authorities, to which he appeals: I informed him, that he must read, and compare the originals: and I indicated to him, where those originals were to be found."

"Now it appears from his own quotations, that he has not read any of those authorities: but is led on blindly by the blind, whose paragraphs fill his voluminous compilation, even *verbatim*, with *assertions* without proofs, and with calumnies, which every man at all acquainted with Irish History, had read *usque ad nauseam* before I had written to him on the subject!"

“ Surely if Mr. Plowden had not been so unfortunately misguided, he could never have been guilty of abusing one of the greatest and most honorable men our country has produced, with a malignity and a coarseness of Language, which no transaction of his whole life can possibly justify! He asserts, that the internal dissensions of the Catholics at this time were *most actively fomented* by Ormond; that to cover the *turpitude* of his own conduct, he imposed upon the Lord Mayor of Dublin by a *forged* or a forced letter from the King, obliging him to surrender Dublin to the Puritans: that in surrendering Dublin he acted with interested views to his own domestic concerns; having stipulated with the Puritanical Commissioners for a large sum of money, as the *price* of his own *base* surrender: and that he thus *infamously betrayed the authority and trust of the King*. Plowden's Hist. Rev. of Ireland, Vol. 1. page 4 & 52.

*“ And yet our modern compilers of *Historical Reviews* of the State of Ireland are not ashamed to confess, that for *very obvious* reasons they have chosen to follow Leland's, and Sir John Davies's opinions, both as to the nature of Ireland, and the dispositions of its Inhabitants. (Plowden's Irish Hist. vol. 1. p. 452) Their reasons may be very *obvious* to themselves. We write history by the *foot square*, when from laziness, or incapacity, or from
impatience

impatience to proceed without the *labour of enquiry*, we copy whole pages from quartos of bigotry, of ignorance and declamation."

In speaking of the transactions of 1641, 2, and 3, he says * "Plowden dates the King's first commission to treat with the confederates Jan. 14, 1642, (p.141) and the subsequent meeting of the Commissioners at *Castle-Martin*, June 28, 1642: and yet he makes Ormond refer in that meeting to the King's letter of the 2nd July in 1643. See *Histor. Rev.* 144."

"† Mr Plowden says, that the book called *Cambrensis Eversus* was written by a very learned person, Mr. Josiah Lynch Titular Arch-Bishop of Tuam, *Hist. v. 1. p 6.* Now there never was a Mr. Josiah Lynch Titular Arch-Bishop or Bishop of any diocese in Ireland."

"‡ Granted then, that Keating's Chronology is inaccurate, so is O'Halloran's, so is Leland's, so is Plowden's, so is every one, who has yet ventured to dabble in Irish History, what then? Is every historical fact to be rejected, because it has been displaced. Are historical monuments to be destroyed, because they have been disfigured by barbarism, mutilated by time, or misquoted by ignorance? Does it follow, that because Keating and Vallancey refer to the times of Pope Urban II, transactions, which occurred in the days of his predecessors, therefore

* Page 45 & 46.

† Page 79.

‡ Page 85.

therefore those transactions are to be utterly denied.”

“ * If then those qualities, which Ormond so eminently possessed, united with the conciliating accounts I am about to relate, had no effect in bringing the mass of the people to any terms for the defence of the Monarchy, we must look for the cause of their opposition to a source very different from that *implacable malevolence of Ormond towards them*, which Mr. Plowden arguing from the *religious cry* of the nuncio and of his foreign influenced Bishops, so unjustly assigns. With regard to the imputation of hatred to the Catholics of Ireland.—I have read Ormond’s letters, and all that has been written on that subject, from N. French, the Catholic Bishop of Fern’s *unkind deserter*, down to Plowden’s declamatory compilation, entitled an *Historical Review*, and I say distinctly, that it is a malicious falsehood propagated by the *foreign influenced* men of Ireland, by the ultramontane Bishops, and by the *scurrilous and ignorant writers of our times*.

“ † And yet this is the Ormond, of whom Mr. Plowden says, in his usual declamatory stile, that he was of a sanguinary disposition towards the Catholics (Histl. Rev. p. 143) that his *detestation* of the Catholics (ib. 145) his *inveteracy* towards them (ib. 147) his *virulence* against them (ib. 148) and his *reluctance to obey any of the King’s commands favorable to them* (ib.

* Page 226-7.

† Page 259.

(ib. 151) were *inflexible*: and that few instances of more *machiavelian* policy occur in history, than in his conduct towards them, excepting, that he never completely dissembled his *execration of the Catholics*. (ib. 158) This sort of language can scarcely be tolerated amongst civilised nations. It may pass in the vulgar and bigotted pamphleteering jargon of a Castabala: but in history! and from a Lawyer! from a man, who in every assertion ought to be guided by evidence, it is scandalous, it is quite unpardonable—*pudet!* A Grotius would not have written so! Never! I am sorry, that there are blots in the maps of the most liberal and enlightened nations! Mr. Plowden himself quotes a letter of Ormond's, in which *he expresses his fear*, that if he protected the Catholics to the extent they desired, he should have been utterly deserted by all the Protestants of the kingdom.* Now this alone would be a sufficient justification in the mind of any one but of a bigot, without recurring to vile calumny: and would suffice to unravel the whole of Ormond's conduct towards the Catholics, in such bloody and detestable times!"

Courteous

* Carte's Orm. vol. 3. p. 322. "If says he, I take the charge of this army upon me (i e of the Catholic army) or denounce immediately an offensive War against the Scots, not ten Protestants will follow me, but rather rise as one man, and adhere to the Scots." Mr. Plowden quotes this very letter p. 151.

The letter
writer lays
claim to
honor and
honesty.

Courteous reader, whoever you are, I beg leave once for all to lay in my claim to *honor and honesty* in all, that I ever have published directly or indirectly respecting Ireland: I shall endeavour not to travel out of the charge, but that field affords an extensive range. An honest or an honorable man cannot sit passive and silent under the complicated accusation of having given to the world as true and authentic history, a declamatory compilation of malignant and coarse misrepresentation against authorities and without authorities, of plagiarisms by the foot square from quartos of bigotry, ignorance and declamation, of falsehood, anachronism, calumny, bigotry and scurrility; fabricated for the purposes of deception by a man of laziness and incapacity, impatient of the labour of enquiry, misguided and misleading, asserting without proof and traducing with conscious malevolence, a vulgar pamphleteer, and disgracing his profession of the Law.

Views and
motives for
printing
this letter.

* A part of this attack, which was all I had read of it whilst writing my history since the Union, called for that note† which refers to it in the 3d vol. But in as much, as a regular and succinct history will not admit of investigations and disquisitions upon particular points, however important to the nation, of which the history is written, I have thought proper to

* Columbanus ad Hybernos, Letter 2. p. 221, &c.

† Page 816 to p. 821.

to adopt this mode of throwing in full daylight upon a particular subject, that will necessarily bring before the public, facts and circumstances developing more in detail a system, which vitally affects the religion government and happiness of Ireland. So harsh an impeachment of the character and veracity of an historian challenges him to meet it in the most direct manner, so as to provoke instant full and open discussion. Barring personal grounds for courting fair investigation, I feel it an indispensable duty to support that credit for veracity, upon which alone could have been bottomed the gratifying communication made to me by his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales, when he graciously accepted the presentation copy of my history of Ireland from its Invasion to her Union with Great Britain, which by his Royal permission was dedicated to him : viz. *That his Royal Highness proposes to himself, much satisfaction in the perusal of it, not only from the conviction of the authenticity of your researches, but in as much, as they regard a people, for whose happiness his Royal Highness feels the deepest interest.*" The specific task I now take in hand, is to lay before the public the authorities, upon which I have said what I have concerning *Columbanus* and every subject, which affects him and those, who have come forward before the public, to deny, disguise, suppress or misrepresent facts, which I have narrated or referred to, because I did and still do consider them eminently conducive to the

B illustration

illustration of the wicked and dangerous policy of governing Ireland.

Duties of
the histori-
an and
liberty of
the people.

In the present overstretched efforts to silence the constitutional liberty of the press, I am not insensible of the scorching heat of the insidious embers, upon which the cotemporary historian treads. If the freedom of the press extend its influence to any species of writing, it emiently does to that, which instructs the living generation in the nature, views and consequences of its existing government. To render the attempt as legal and constitutional to the individual in the execution, as it is hazardous and important to the nation in its consequences, I am free to declare, that I have attempted to follow with punctilious scrupulosity the golden rules prescribed by Cicero for writing history; a fragment of which has been blunted by hacneyed repetition. Every Sciolist has incessantly upon his tongue *ne quid falsi dicere audeat, ni quid vere non audeat*.* The context rarely falls under the eyes of ordinary readers; and the author, even at the hazard of the odious charge of pedantry, copies the entire passage as an impenetrable Ægis against the little passions, the mercenary asperity, and official zeal of bad governors and their venal hirelings. “For who knows not, that it “is the first rule of history, not to dare to say any “thing,

* Cic de Oratore, Lib. 11. s. 62;

“ thing, that is false ; then, not to dare to omit
 “ any thing, that is true. Let there be no suspicion
 “ of favor in writing : nor any personal malice.
 “ These foundations are known to all. But the
 “ superstructure consists of things and words.
 “ The nature of the first requires order of time,
 “ description of places ; also in great affairs worthy
 “ of remembrance, first the designs, then the ex-
 “ ecution, and afterwards the results are expected
 “ to be handled. The writer must express what
 “ he himself approves of in the design : and as to
 “ the execution of it, he must not only declare
 “ what was said or done, but also in what manner.
 “ And when the results (or consequences) are
 “ handled, that all the causes (or motives) whether
 “ of accident, wisdom or rashness be thoroughly
 “ explained : and that not only the exploits of the
 “ actors themselves be set forth ; but the general
 “ conduct and character of such of them, as have
 “ any pretensions to a name or reputation in life.
 “ But the selection of words, and stile of writing,
 “ to be clear and easy, flowing with a certain calm
 “ and even current, equally void of judicial asperity,
 “ and the pungency of forensic declamation.”

I solemnly declare, that I attempted to write my
 history according to these rules ; sensible, that by
 so doing I performed the awful duty I owed to the
 illustrious personage, to whom the work is dedicated,

to the high spirited and loyal people, whose history it is, and to the unworthy individual, who has taken the arduous task in hand.

THE AUTHOR.



AN
HISTORICAL LETTER,
TO THE
Rev. CHARLES O'CONOR, D.D.
STILLING HIMSELF
COLUMBANUS.

REV. SIR, & MOST LEARNED DOCTOR,*

ONE of the effects of a free press, is to draw forth individual judgments and opinions upon public men and measures. Every man, who publishes a work, is fully responsible to the law and the

Effects of
a free press

* There appears throughout the writings of *Columbanus* a peculiar sense of his own consequence. I wish not to be deficient in paying respect to it, where it clashes not with truth or duty. In the first of his publications, which came under my eye, in 1805, and of which I shall have occasion to speak hereafter, (being his own anticipated critique of his then intended and still expected Latin work) *Rerum Hybernicarum scriptores antiqui ex vetustis MSS &c.* A Carolo O Conor, D. D. the initials in Latin, I presume, stand for *Doctor Doctissimus*. The usual stile of graduated theologians once was, *Sacrae Theologiae Doctor*, S. T. D.

the individual for every word of it : and meanly will *he* be considered, who affects to evade personal accountability for what the exigency of the public cause calls upon him to disclose or comment upon. Not only public scenes affecting the interest of the nation are to be faithfully represented, but the secret mechanism, which compleated the scenic exhibition is to be developed, when the spectators are no longer to be amused by deception, but to be benefited by instruction. There are facts and circumstances deeply affecting the character and welfare of a nation, which not only may, but which ought to be fully and distinctly set forth, so as to be thoroughly understood and efficiently acted upon by the people interested in or affected by them. In my attempt to bring under the public eye a portion of Irish history, I renounced all discretion in selecting events, which had a tendency to disclose the spirit and means of carrying on the government of that part of the United Kingdom. The same duty forbad suppression, disguise and misrepresentation. Little does it behove me to say any thing of my fitness to attempt the Herculean toil. I have (perhaps too adventurously) applied my shoulders ; but have hitherto felt no disposition to relax my efforts.

The field
of history
common to
all.

To you Sir I am not accountable for the views and motives, which originally induced me to employ my pen upon the subject of Irish History. By law it is common field, which every man has a right to travel

travel over, provided he convert not his journey to the purposes of favor, malice or wanton trespass on private character. My acrimonious accuser Sir Richard Musgrave charged me with being a *volunteer*, *an eager volunteer* : and it will appear hereafter, that my volunteering in the cause of Ireland was also offensive to your Reverence, even before you had seen a page of what I had written. Volunteer as I am, I disclaim not discipline : the first principle of which is obedience to the voice of truth. Historical truth can be no libel : it is an act of indispensable justice to the governors and governed of the people, who are the subject of the history. The individual, who has acted a part on the national theatre, from that moment opens his conduct and character to the observations and critiques of every man, who undertakes the public charge and duty of an historian. That duty is awfully severe in diligence of research, impartiality of judgment and veracity of assertion according to the best evidence to be procured.

It frequently happens, that a very simple though important conclusion is drawn from a long and complicated chain of evidence, which the succinct style of annals or history will not permit the writer to enter into. The historian, who claims credit for veracity, will make no assertion nor draw any conclusion, which he is not enabled to substantiate by evidence, when called upon to refute a malicious or groundless charge of falsehood or misrepresentation.

An historian often concludes without going through the evidence, which supports the conclusion.

When

When therefore a gentleman, Reverend Sir, of your profession, acquirements, and rank in life comes forward in so austere and authoritative a tone, to charge me with *the guilt of abusing one of the greatest and most honorable men our country has produced, with a malignity and a coarseness of language, which no transaction of his whole life can possibly justify, &c.* no man of honor and honesty will censure me for supporting my credit for historical veracity, for vindicating the honor and rendering justice to the people of Ireland, for repelling the foul charge of the *flagitious crime of wilful misrepresentation*, of which you say in one paragraph *I do not mean, that Mr. Plowden is guilty*, though in the next you bluntly charge him with doing it with *malignity and coarseness of language*. Now nothing but *wilfulness* can affix *malignity* to any *misrepresentation*. My readers will judge of the *coarseness of my language*. From deference to them, I endeavoured to render it clear, simple and strong. If I have failed, I regret the inability to effectuate my wish. Your assumption of *a right* to complain of my being misguided by the *foreign influence men*, because you had warned and cautioned me against trusting to any of them, not only superadds to my obligation and duty of placing the whole transaction before the public, but would render criminal any suppression of the evidence, upon which I have written what has already appeared in print, which remotely or proximately affects you.

It

It is necessary to premise, that every publication, whether in newspapers or pamphlets, which tends to question the veracity of what I have found it necessary to assert or refer to in my history concerning you, Reverend and most learned Doctor, your beneficent patron of the present hour, or your bifronted hero of the turbid days of Cromwell and the Stuarts, will be noticed in that manner, which shall most distinctly explain to your countrymen *all the causes, or motives, whether of accident wisdom or rashness*, that regulate your general conduct, or affect your public character and writings. In the note before referred to, I said, what gave rise to my correspondence with you, was my wish to render as perfect, as possible, the historical review of the State of Ireland, which I then had in hand; to procure certain materials touching Catholic Irish affairs during the last century, which you alone possess amongst your grandfathers papers. Out of this circumstance arose a correspondence, which from its nature was national, and therefore public for every national purpose.

Whoever publishes his thoughts, opens a correspondence with every man, who chuses openly to notice or censure the publication. I consequently offer no particular reason, much less an apology, for the remarks and observations, which I shall take the liberty of making upon what you have said in print. As therefore you have in a printed letter to your

C

country

Every Author by his publication opens a correspondence with every man who chuses to address him.

countrymen publickly claimed *a right* to complain of my not having followed or heeded your cautions and warnings, but permitted myself to be led on blindly by the blind, and having been guilty of abusing one of the greatest and most honorable men of your country with malignity and coarseness of language &c, I claim equal right to apprize your countrymen what those cautions and warnings were, how they came to be given, and why I so far rejected and despised them, as to have excited your displeasure and offence. Though a simple Laic I cannot allow you, Reverend and most learned Doctor, the exclusive advantage of one of your mottos from the learned Fleury* *Flattery and servile complaisance*

* The four different letters of Columbanus are not reprehended, because they contain no truth; but, because the most learned Doctor has endeavoured to seduce his countrymen under the most splendid and glittering banners of truth, historical and theological, into vital errors of policy and religion. He stands forth, as the exclusive champion of veracity, having forced into requisition every general axiom or adage upon *truth*, (that inflexible emanation of the Divinity) from the councils, fathers, and writers of the Church down to the modern philosophers of France. "Let us look up, says he, to that being, whose judgments hang suspended over our heads. *Sursum Corda!* Let us remember, that truth requires no quibbles of Casuistry to be urged in her defence: that we can never impose upon hearers or readers by partial representations; that honesty is the best policy &c." (Col. ad Hib. p. 118) Here I join issue: and am free to avow, that I cordially admit with Jno. Bayle, that *truth ought to be promoted in all things*, against Varro, Origen,

plaisance are odious vices. Freedom and courage in
 C 2 *support*

Eusebius, and St. Jerome, or whomever else Columbanus may quote for practising deception and falsehood to obtain a laudable end. At the same time and upon the same principle will I support every truth, though advanced for the wicked purpose of masking, circulating or confirming error. It is fitting here to arrest the readers attention to the use made of his learning by the accurate consistent and liberal D.D. He *asserts*, (4 Colum. p. 95) *that the nuncio and his Bishops held, that error and falsehood were allowable, if they tended to promote their cause.* To prove which serious charge, he gives quotations from the heathen Varro, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, Origen and Eusebius; and informs his readers, that President Bradshaw had declared in open court, that he had corresponded with Colonel Andrews by counterfeit letters in the King's name to worm out secrets, which brought Colonel Andrews to the block: Nay, so earnest is he in dealing out his learning, that in (p.100) he exclaims in an extraordinary strain against christain credulity in all ages, to prove against the Pope's nuncio and the confederate Catholics in the days of Charles the First, that they actually acted upon the unchristain principle of doing harm, that good might come of it. "It is vain to dissemble, that in all ages of christianity, men professing its doctrines have not scrupled at any means to bring about a good and pious end." "It is necessary, says the learned Eusebius, to use falsehood as a medicine for the benefit of those, who will not be convinced without it." To shew his knowledge of the learned languages, he gives the words of Eusebius in Greek: and as a specimen of his correctness in quoting, he refers his reader to (Prop. Evang. l. xii, c. 31.) We are to presume, that by these Latin abbreviations are meant Eusebius' work, *De præparatione and demonstratione Evangelicâ.* Eusebius was certainly a very learned man, though inclined to Arianism: he knew

support of truth are christian virtues, which are ingredients of piety. Imagine not, that I mean to enter into the polemical lists with the most learned Doctor upon theological matter. You have thought proper openly, and not very tenderly, to attack me, as a writer of Irish History: in that character alone I now lay before the public the grounds and documents, upon which I have introduced your name into my publications. In two separate characters have you brought yourself forward at different times and under different circumstances, as claiming the notice of your countrymen. First as their annalist or historian; then as a theologian combating the synodical resolutions of your Hierarchy, defending yourself from the charge of schism, and attempting with more than gratuitous zeal, to rivet division in the

every thing written before his own days. The suspicion of his orthodoxy, probably, enhanced the weight of his authority in the eyes of Columbanus, who so warmly espouses the condemned errors of Aerius, Wickliffe and Calvin upon the equality of Bishops and Priests, which equally contravene the tenets of the Established Protestant Religion, as those of the Roman Catholic Church. The reader is again reminded, that all this ostentation of learned quotations is brought together to fix Rinucini and the confederated Catholics of Ireland in 1646 with holding, that *error and falsehood were allowable to promote their cause.* I must at all times hold with St. Bernard, as I have heard him quoted, that *melius est, ut scandalum oriatur, quam ut verum non dicatur.* Still higher authority forbids the commission of evil, that good may come from it,

the body of your Catholic countrymen. As you have made one of your theological effusions the vehicle of a most ferocious attack upon me, in order to discredit my history, I shall first, and indeed principally address you in the character of an historian, by examining your credit for sincerity, patriotism, fidelity, accuracy, candor, decency, consistency, and truth.

In the year 1801 I proposed to Mr. Ad-
 dington (now Lord Viscount Sidmouth) the ex-
 pediency of having a fair impartial and authentic
 history of Ireland to counteract the baneful effects
 of the government's holding out, considering and
 dealing with the Irish nation, as if they were incor-
 rigible rebels by disposition, principle and religion :
 an evil, then much encreased by the countenance and
 forced circulation of Sir Richard Musgrave's slande-
 rous and mischievous memoirs.* I represented to
 him, that the Irish nation was preeminently fond of
 historical justice, and felt more sensibly, than any other
 people the deprivation of it : and that it had there-
 fore become a national object, that such a work
 should be brought before the public. That Minis-
 ter's accession to my proposal brought me to Dublin
 in the autumn of the year 1801. It would be use-
 less to prove to my reader, that I was anxious to
 procure information from every quarter, that was
 likely to possess it : I then had the good fortune to
 be

Circum-
 stances, un-
 der which
 the Histo-
 rical Re-
 view was
 underta-
 ken.

* Vid. my Postliminious preface published in London,
 and Dublin 1804.

be introduced to a gentleman of a liberal and informed mind, of free and polished manners, a real patriot, and a christian philosopher, Dr. Hugh M'Dermott of Coolavin, your worthy and near relative.* During my stay in Ireland I availed myself as often as I could, of his agreeable and instructive conversation.† After I left Ireland, I corresponded with him

* This gentleman is not only a maternal grandson of the late Charles O'Connor of Balanagare, but is married to his own first cousin his paternal granddaughter, the sister of Columbanus.

† It is proper once for all to notice, that of whatever letters Dr. O'Connor has obliged me to refer to, I shall only publish such parts, as concern the subject at issue between us, which could not otherwise be brought to decision; pledging myself at the same time, that the parts omitted do not affect, or in any manner alter the sense of the quotations. Some time after my introduction to my highly valued and esteemed friend Dr. M'Dermott, I received from him the following letter, which is proof of the advantage and benefit it was to Ireland and myself, to have been introduced to that source of liberality and knowledge.

Boooterstown, Sep. 24, 1801.

DEAR SIR,

I am extremely sorry, that my being so far removed from my books and papers puts it out of my power to be of any use to your present undertaking. I am unwilling to state facts from memory alone: and those facts, which I could state, I cannot authenticate, as the proofs are not now within my reach. A man, who sits down as you do, and with your principles, to write for posterity, will write nothing, but

him for some time, but on no other subject, than
the

what he knows or believes to be true: and his belief (where matters do not come within his own immediate knowledge) will be founded on the best evidence, which the nature of the case will admit of. That evidence I have not here to bring forward, so as to satisfy either myself or you; and I think it better to suppress many useful facts, than hazard one doubtful assertion, which might hereafter be disproved. Your history will in this respect differ from your cotemporary writers. They are the historians of a party, and give us only one side of the picture. They heap facts upon facts; not such as they know to be true, but as they wish to be true. What they wish, they are very ready to believe, or affect to believe; and it is a maxim of their morality, that a man may swear to his belief: therefore he may give it as history. On the other hand, they are extremely unwilling to believe, and still more unwilling to relate any fact, which is disagreeable to themselves. On such facts they are silent from design; and thus it may be said, that they lie by their very silence. Thus their history is calumny, both in what it says, and in what it does not say. It is like a two-edged sword; it cuts either way.

It is a melancholy fact, that while some can publish falsehoods with impunity, others cannot tell truth without danger. Those amongst us, who would give a faithful narrative of our late unhappy transactions, are silent from fear or from prudence: we are tired of prosecution and persecution, of which we have all more or less witnessed the effects, either in ourselves, or in our neighbours. The laws since the year 1795 have had but a partial, a party operation; as was but too plainly evinced by the infliction of unmerited or unequal punishment, or the refusal of equal justice.

As to the resumption of ancient properties, on which we had some conversation the other day, I beg leave to mention,

the necessity and means of doing historical justice

what did not then occur to me, that in the year 1792 the Irish Catholics framed and took a public test, relinquishing all such idle claims and imaginary pretensions. The test also extended to other points, or charges, which were urged against them; it was acceded to and signed by all the respectable Catholics in the kingdom, whose names affixed to their declaration on these points, were published in all the papers. The measure at that time seemed to give very general satisfaction; and it either satisfied or silenced their enemies. As I relate this from memory, and may be wrong, I do not desire you to give ample credit to this circumstance, until I can establish it by printed documents.

In the historian it is perfectly fair and right to mention, that the charge of resumption was urged openly by *one party*; but then it will be but candid to mention also, that the charge was denied or repelled by the *other* in the most ample and satisfactory manner they could. It will then rest with the impartial reader to say, whether he has more faith in the charge, than in the refutation.

I have applied to a friend in Dublin to procure me some authentick information on points, which it may be of consequence to have cleared up for you. I have been promised a copy of the dissertations. If you have any doubts on particular questions, perhaps I may be able to solve the one, or to answer the other. My means of serving you are very limited indeed, which I cannot sufficiently regret. I congratulate my country on this Work having fallen into your hands, whom abilities and candour equally qualify for the undertaking. Your history will not be like that of Sir Richard Musgrave—*recentibus odiis composita*. You know with Livy, that an historian is or ought to be---*qui nil falsi dicere audeat, nil veri dicere non audeat*.

I am with great esteem, Dear Sir,

your very assured humble Servant,

HUGH M'DERMOTT.

to the Irish nation, in which I still consider him as sympathizing with me, with the same ardor of a true Irishman, which he ever manifested to me both by word and writing. I returned to London in the month of November 1801, and Dr. M'Dermott, did, as he had kindly undertaken, write to you in my favor, to prepare me an introduction, whenever I should wish to have personal communication with you.

Before I left Dublin, Dr. M'Dermott had the kindness to read over what manuscript I had prepared. To his knowledge, experience and judgment I paid great deference upon matters of Irish history. On the eve of my intended departure from Dublin, he returned me the manuscript, with a letter containing the following lines. "If, contrary to my wish, I should be disappointed in seeing you again, be kind enough to let me know your address in London. At present I can only say, that I have read your sheets with encreasing pleasure every page, and I can safely assert, that so candid and liberal a production relative to Irish history never issued from the pen of an Englishman.*" That letter also contained a postscript to the following effect. "I received this day a letter from my friend

Doctor M^d
Dermott's
opinion of
the Histori-
cal Review

D

"Dr.

* The reader is assured, that the originals of all the letters quoted are in the possession of the author: and he conceives, that he holds them as evidence, on behalf of the Irish nation, whose history he has written, and which they tend to verify.

“ Dr. O’Conor, who is still at Oxford, but goes to
 “ Stowe very shortly. He says, the Grenville party
 “ all disapprove of the peace: that it is doubtful,
 “ whether Pitt will support it, and that Mr. Adding-
 “ ton will have to encounter a formidable opposi-
 “ tion.”

Dr. O’Con-
 nor’s sup-
 pressed
 volume of
 memoirs of
 the O’Con-
 or family.

During my sejour in Dublin, Dr. M’Dermott gave me a printed volume in octavo, which had no title, and which he told me had never been published, or had been suppressed by you at the suggestion, or by the desire, or through the influence of your liberal patron the Marquis of Buckingham. The Work was intended to comprize the Memoirs of the O’Con- or family, and the second volume though prepared for press, was kept back. The first volume is a loose and ill digested compilation of several valuable and interesting documents and occurrences in Irish history, particularly concerning your own ancestors, who were real friends to their country. It contains no matter, which ought not be published and circu- lated as widely as possible, for the information and credit of your countrymen. But *Aletheophobia* ever has been been, and ever will be the unvarying symp- tom of false friendship to Ireland.* When after the lecture,

* The reader is requested, not to suppose, that my Reverend and most learned correspondent gave rise exclusively to this observation. Before I was aware of the necessity of bringing his most learned Reverence before the public, I had occasion in 1804 to publish a postliminious preface to my Historical

lecture of that volume, I reflected, that you the author

D 2 the

Review, in which (p. 69 of the Dublin Edt.) I said. "If
 "Ireland after the Union be not emancipated, fitting it is,
 "that the Irish should know the men and the measures, that
 "keep them out of this long sighed for land of promise."
 On which text I remarked in a note: "The irritation and
 "virulence of the *British Critic* and other anonymous writers,
 "who are stimulated and hired to disgorge their venom at the
 "Historical Review, shew, and it has become the author's
 "duty, to unfold the conspiracy formed not merely against
 "Catholic Emancipation, but against the publication of the truth
 "of Irish history." Within fewer than six months from the
 publication of that *postliminious preface* Dr. O'Connor had pro-
 bably heard his liberal Mæcenæ complain, as he often has,
 of the author of the Historical Review, who could not have
 given such a distorted misrepresentation of the Buckingham
 administration, unless it had been dictated to him by Mr.
 Grattan. The author had no communication direct or indirect
 with that great man, whilst he was writing it. But some time
 after its publication, when he had read it, he honoured the
 author with a letter containing the following testimony of his
 approbation in unison with that of Dr. M'Dermott, which is
 presumed to be contrasted against the judgment of the Reverend
 Charles O'Connor D.D. upon the same work. "You are one
 "of the very few Irish historians, who have ventured to deal
 "in the commodity called truth. You have done so like a
 "man, with vigor and ability, against the tide of power and
 "prejudice. You must look to the reward of merit, i. e. the
 "censure of those, whose censure is panegyric. Some of
 "those, who have attempted to write the history of Ireland
 "are men, who sold themselves and the country. Their his-
 "tory is their apology, not the recitation of facts. They are
 "bigots, and they are slaves, bought and sold. Your history
 "carries with it a characteristical stamp, that it was written
 "by a freeman."

of it had suppressed it, that you had quitted the obligatory functions of your vocation in your own country, to become the dependent and creature of the nobleman, who had procured that suppression, that you had transferred from Balanagare the valuable collection of your grandfathers books and papers to that nobleman's library at Stowe, as much of your patron's political conduct, as he ever dared to make public, rushed into my mind. I reviewed him slinking from the back stairs at St. James into the debate of the Peers, huckstering amongst the Lords of the Bed chamber and others in the pay of the court, the smuggled* influence of the Royal closet, by which base manœuvre the secret power behind the throne gained the ascendancy over the constitutional exercise of the Royal will through the

* His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales voted in the minority, when by this back stairs manœuvre the King's ministers were outvoted, and Mr. Fox's East India Bill was thrown out of the Lords: and the empire thenceforth plunged into the unfathomable disasters of Mr. Pitt's system. His R. Highness has often declared, that he never gave a vote, which he thought, at the time of giving it, more consonant with the will of his Royal Father. Surely, if your liberal patron did by any means during that debate know the real will and wishes of his Sovereign, it would have been but decent in him, to communicate them to his Royal Highness, to prevent a difference of opinion between the Sovereign and the Heir Apparent, or allow the latter to retire, if he chose, without dividing even against this equivocal and un-constitutional communication of his Royal Father's wishes or feelings.

the legal and responsible ministers of the crown : by which the enlightened councils of the incorruptible Fox were proscribed from St. James's, and the desperate and tyrannical Pitt was stimulated by the back stair sycophants to open Pandora's box upon the empire. The contents of it are still operating their destructive havoc upon us. I followed your patron through various efforts to support the Pitt system in England and Ireland* to the national festival for the
King's

* A reference to my history of Ireland in 2 vols. octavo, whilst under an injunction, might be misconstrued into a contempt of court, by presuming it to be in circulation in defiance of its order : it is moreover incumbent upon me to falsify the charge of my being led on blindly by the blind, and gagging after the foreign influence men like a wild goose, assertions without proof and calumnies *ad nauseam*. I shall therefore present to my readers a compendious and faithful *tableau* of your patron's administration of Ireland from the inimitable hand of Ireland's most favoured model of talent, truth, and patriotism. If there be truth in the trite saying, *like master like man*, this exhibition will not be considered a *hors d'œuvre* (Speech of Grattan in Par. Deb. 15) “ Such has been the
“ conduct of your Reformer. This was the man ; you
“ remember his entry into the capital, trampling on the hears,
“ of the Duke of Rutland, and seated in a triumphant Car,
“ drawn by public credulity. On one side fallacious hope,
“ and on the other many mouthed profession : a figure with
“ two faces ; one turned to the treasury ; and the other presented to the people with a double tongue speaking contradictory language. This minister alights : justice looks
“ up to him with ample hopes, and speculation faints with idle
“ alarms. He finds the city a prey to an un-constitutional

King's recovery in 1789, where he toasted that ill-fated minister, *as the friend to Ireland*, next to the King and Queen, and to the exclusion of His R. Highness the Prince of Wales. You, Reverend and most learned Doctor, cannot have forgotten, however you may now disapprove of the two Houses of the Irish Parliament having prepared an address (your patron refused to forward it) to His Royal Highness, to take upon himself during his Royal Father's indisposition, the government of the Kingdom according to its laws and constitution, with all regal powers jurisdiction

“ police—he continues it. He finds the country over burthened
 “ with a shameful pension list—he encreases it. He finds the
 “ House of Commons swarming with placemen—he multiplies
 “ them. He finds the salary of the Secretary encreased to
 “ prevent a pension—he grants a pension. He finds the king-
 “ dom drained by absentee employments, and by compensa-
 “ tions to buy them home—he gives the best reversion in the
 “ country to an absentee—his brother. He finds the govern-
 “ ment at different times had disgraced itself by creating
 “ sinecures, to gratify corrupt affection—he makes two com-
 “ missioners of the rolls, and gives one of them to another
 “ brother. He finds the second council to the commissioners
 “ put down because useless—he renews it. He finds the
 “ boards of accounts and stamps annexed by public compact—
 “ he divides them. He finds three resolutions, declaring,
 “ that seven commissioners are sufficient—he makes nine.—
 “ He finds the country has suffered by some peculations in
 “ the ordnance—he encreases the salaries of offices, and gives
 “ the places to Members—to Members of Parliament.”

jurisdiction and prerogatives thereto belonging. Hence the fatal precedent for the late un-constitutional restriction of the Regent's powers by the avowed disciples of the Pitt school. I then anticipated the horror and aversion of your new Mæcenas, at the prospect of any independent unbiassed and faithful history of that government, which he had twice administered upon the principles of the Pitt system. Still however I would not expose myself to the imputation of having omitted any opportunity, which lay before me, of procuring information and document for authenticating my historical researches. I endeavoured through a common friend to secure the longed for interview. The following letter, which I received after my return to London, bespeaks the patriotic sympathy, with which Dr. M'Dermott endeavoured to forward the success of my application to you.

Boosterstown, Nov. 20, 1801. Letter
from Dr.
M'Dermott

DEAR SIR,

I take the pen to inform you, that Mr. O'Connor's address is, Stowe, Buckingham. I have already acquainted him with the nature of your undertaking, and of the objects it embraces; to promote which I have made it a point with him, that he should furnish you with all the materials within his reach. I am sensible however, that it must be extremely difficult to communicate much historical information by letter, except as to particular facts or dates, which may appear dubious to you. If there be any such, and that you mention them by letter to Mr. O'Connor, I have no doubt, but that he will be able either to elucidate those matters himself, or at least, that he will point out the best sources of information to you.
There

There is scarce any book on Irish history or antiquities, which you may have occasion for, that he cannot furnish you with, if you cannot procure it in London. I wish, however, that same chance may bring him to that city: as he might shew you his second volume, the manuscript of which he might be unwilling to part with. On the whole, I have requested him to render you every assistance in his power, and I hope you will find him as liberal in his communications, as he ought to be.

Mr. O'Leary must, I apprehend, have been misinformed: Mr. O'Connor wrote no continuation of Curry's *Historical Review*. He wrote an *Introduction* to it, at considerable length, which was prefixed to the Quarto edition, but omitted afterwards in the Octavo edition by an ill-judged parsimony. He also wrote a summary of Irish history in the article of Ireland in Guthrie's *Geography*, which was published in Dublin by Chambers about the year 1788 in Quarto; at least a great part of that article was furnished by Mr. O'Connor. It may not be amiss, that you should see both it and the *Introduction*. The latter was highly spoken of by the *Monthly Review*.

The further researches of Mr. O'Connor into our history are either scattered in pamphlets, which principally relate to the penal laws, or are diffused amongst his manuscripts, which are all in the hands of Dr. Charles O'Connor at Stowe. We purpose going down to Connaught in about a fortnight. I should be happy if a return to my books and papers could enable me to send you any timely communications. You may at all times freely command my best exertions; and you may be assured of my good wishes for the speedy completion of your Work. Last week I had a letter from Dr. O'Connor, who was then at Brazen-nose, Oxford. He therein tells me, that Cox is the greatest liar of all our historians, except Morrison. He quotes to me the following passage from the body of Cox's Work.

“ Oh

"Oh that they were the Irish papists, who cut off King Charles's head! Oh! that they had been the guilty regicides! But alas, &c. &c."

I am, with great esteem and regard,

Dear Sir,

Your very assured Servant,

HUGH M'DERMOTT.

As soon after the receipt of this letter as the progress I had made in the manuscript, and my professional engagements would allow of, I wrote to you on the 6th of February from London, to the following effect.

The letter writer's first application to his correspondent.

Essex-Street, London, Feb. 6, 1801.

DEAR SIR,

Although I have not the honor of being personally known to you, yet I trust, that the communications made to you concerning me, and the business, which carried me over to Ireland last autumn by Dr. M'Dermott, will apologize not only for the liberty I now take in troubling you with this letter, but also in entreating the favor of your letting me know, where you shall be on or about the 12th of the month, in order that I may have an opportunity of some conversation with you. Should you be at Oxford, I will come thither: if at Stowe, I will come to the Inn near that place, which I recollect many years ago, and I presume still subsists. Should this find you at Oxford, I shall esteem an immediate answer a very singular favor. I have the honor to be with great esteem and respect,

Sir, your obedient humble Servant,

FRANCIS PLOWDEN.

To the Rev. Dr. O'Connor,

Brazen-nose College, Oxford.

E

In

The author's claims to refer to Doctor O'Conor's letters.

In the note, which I have introduced into the 3d volume of my Post Union history (p. 820) I have laid in my claim to avail myself of your letters, which *you* first made public mention of. From them you have endeavoured to fix me with an obligation of attending to your counsels, directions and warnings: and you sternly claim a right to complain of my wilful, malignant, and obstinate inattention to your demands and dictates. Now from the whole context of your letter in answer to my application to you, it is evident, that when you knew no more of my Work, than what you had learnt from Dr. M'Dermott (for the manifestation of the whole truth it becomes necessary to set forth his letters) you were predetermined to oppose, and strangle, if you could in the birth, a Work, which your brother-in-law commended as faithful, dispassionate, and independent. You favoured me with an answer in a very short time, worked up, I am to presume, to the wishes and sympathies of your noble patron, who probaly perused and approved, and certainly franked it from the charge of postage. It held out every imaginable discouragement to the undertaking; refused every thing applied for, which could be granted, and offered every thing, that was not wanted, and was out of your power to grant.

Stowe, Feb. 11, 1802.

Doctor O'Conor's first letter to the author.

SIR,
I sit down to express, as speedily as possible, rather my wish, than my ability, to contribute aid to the Work
you

you are engaged in ; particularly as Dr. M'Dermott has informed me, that a manly contempt for certain prejudices appears to predominate in those passages, which you were so good, as to cummunicate to him ; I mean *Irish* prejudices as well as English ; for, though an Irishman myself, and one of the old *mere* Irish, as you may see by my name, I am come to a period of life, when those fooleries begin to wear their natural complexion with regard to us. The rouge is washed off, and the wrinkles are the more disgusting, the less they were perceived before.

But my good Sir, you mistake in supposing, that I can afford you any service worth purchasing at so dear a rate, as a journey to Oxford, or to Buckingham at this season of the year.

I am engaged in transcribing and translating into Latin and illustrating with notes and a glossary, the ancient Chronicles of Clone and of Ulster. I do not think, that from a person engaged in such pursuits you would derive that species of information, which you stand most in need of. The chronicle of Clone ends where you begin (the 12th century).

I travel down with a few ancient Celtic MSS. the language and characters of which are almost as obsolete and obscure, as those of Persepolis. You travel down with a cloud of witnesses from Giraldus to my late grandfather. These witnesses speak a language, which is intelligible ; you have only to make a proper selection.

If you will ask what I mean by a proper selection ?—I answer, that were I engaged in your task I would set out with this principle, that “*not a man of them is to be depended upon.*”

When I was younger, and had less time to enquire than I have now, I thought, that my grandfather's introduction to Curry was an exact historical painting, as far as it went, of the times, to which it relates. I do not think so now. It is well written considering the time and the circumstances

of the writer; but it is not all true, and I prefer truth to every species of elegance, and eloquence "*rien n'est beau que le vrai.*"

You may judge now what opinion I entertain of others. Dr. M'Dermott informs me, that you take up some facts upon the authority of Cox. Now who was Cox? Take this specimen "and now how gladly would I draw a curtain over that dismal and unhappy 30th of January—wherein the royal father of our country suffered Martyrdom! Oh that I could say they were *Irish* men, who did that abominable fact, or that I could justly lay it at the door of the *Papists*! but how much soever, they might obliquely or designedly contribute to it, 'tis certain, it was actually done by others." (p. 206. vol. 2.)

You see, Sir, we are to take all writers on Irish History "*cum grano salis*" else we shall leap into a volcano—for Ireland has been nothing less for 600 years, and in giving its history we must not go too close to the *Crater*. Horace says of Empedocles—*Deus immortalis haberi dum cupit Empedocles, ardentem frigidus Ætnam insiluit. Sit jus liceatque perire poetis.*

Such was the fate of Leland. Had he never meddled with Irish History, Philip of Macedon might have saved him from the fate of Empedocles. But his Irish History, is a dull edition of Cox, somewhat enlarged—but only enlarged by common place political investigations.

In short—Sir—it requires uncommon application, and an uncommon portion of health, of life, and of leisure to write a complete history, even of the period from the English Invasion to our times. The rolls office, the surveyor general's office, the council books—the Bodleian, the British Museum, the Lambeth Library, the Broderick collection in 30 volumes MSS.—Lord Clarendon's collection, Sir James Ware's, the late Mr. Harris's and the correspondence of our chief Governors for the space of six hundred years are the sources to be consulted—You could gain so little, so very little, by a conference with

with me, that I should deem myself highly culpable, if I did not candidly gave you my opinion, and state how unqualified I am *at present* for such a conference, as you seem to desire. I have taken a large sheet of paper and written a long letter, in order to be as explicit as possible on a subject, which I should be delighted to forward in any other way, that you may think in my power.

I have the honor to be,

Sir, your Obedient Servant,

CHARLES O'CONOR.

My determination to give as true a portrait of Anglo-Ireland as I could procure documents to bear me out, was not to be removed by your picture of difficulties. I traced them to their source. The fate of Empedocles deterred me not from approaching the *crater*, notwithstanding the smoke, fire and larva, with which you, as well as other enemies to the truth of Irish history, threatened to overwhelm me. The refusal of Mr. Abbott, when Secretary to Lord Hardwicke in 1801 to allow me the inspection of State papers notwithstanding Mr. Addington's recommendation, prepared me for what I expressed to that Minister on the 29th of September 1802, that *I must conclude, as I have hitherto proceeded, with the aid of the Shop and the Stall**

The author not discouraged by menace or refusal.

Under

* Vide Postl. Pref. Dub. Ed. 45 and 46; where may be seen Mr. Hiley Addington's answer to that letter six weeks after it had been received; during which period the *Aletheophobia* came to a crisis. It contains these words of redundant caution.—
“*There seems NOW no possibility of your NOW having access to the State papers you mention.*” The whole transaction of my publishing the Historical Review may be seen in that preface and cannot be uninteresting to the indagator of the truth of Irish History.

Under these impressions, I delayed not to return an answer to your discouraging letter. Since you have assumed an authorative right to complain of me to your countrymen for having neglected and contravened your cautions and directions, for the sake of truth, which *you prefer to every species of elegance and eloquence*, I lay before them a copy of the letter, which I wrote to you in answer.

Feb. 15, 1802.

• Letter from
the Author
to his cor-
respondent
in 1802.

SIR,
My thanks are due to you, and I intreat you to accept them for the trouble you have been put to in writing the letter, I had the honor of receiving on Friday.—I most cordially adopt your maxim *Rien n'est beau que le vrai*.

It ever has been and ever shall be the rule of my conduct : and in pursuance of it, on the present occasion I feel it a debt of justice to those, whose cause I have taken in hand, to myself, and to you Sir—to speak without reserve—I am not insensible of the marked anxiety, with which you decline the conference, I so much wished, and still so much desire. Not for my own sake, but for that of truth, and of a much injured nation, which I still presume you have at heart, notwithstanding your boast of having thrown off all *Irish prejudices*.

I must premise, that had not Dr. M'Dermott very strongly assured me of your earnest wishes to co-operate to the same end, which I had in view, I never should have thought of breaking in upon your retirement and pursuits, even for a minute, much less for several hours. I meant no personal liberty; therefore I offer no apology for having asked the favor.

I have undertaken under peculiar circumstances, to write
the

the History of the Union, and propose to avail myself of that opportunity of removing (if possible) a great part of the prejudice, calumnies, contempt and obloquy, under which the Irish Nation has been uniformly represented by all the English and most of the Irish historians, which are likely to meet the eye of the public. My general plan is, &c. (It will be useless to trouble the reader with it).

You will readily perceive Sir, that this plan will not let in any thing like a complete History of Ireland from the invasion to our own times, as you seem to suppose I have undertaken to write. I have selected such matter, as I considered necessary to take off the crust of prejudice, bigotry, and malice, under which the most material and interesting parts of the Irish History have been suppressed from the public eye, or dissipate the dense factitious mist, through which much of that matter has been misrepresented to all those, who have wished to view and consider it in its genuine state. My greatest want of materials is for the 4th chapter, and here I am free to say, that one of my principal views in coming into your neighbourhood (imagine not I ever thought of crossing the threshold of Stowe) for a day or two, was to have endeavoured to prevail upon you, first to read over what manuscript I have ready for the press, (which you could easily do in a day) and secondly to let me in the mean while read over your manuscript of the 2nd volume of your intended publication, (Dr. M'Dermott having procured me a copy of the first volume in print) which he told me, and I presume, relates to the Irish affairs of the last century, materials for which I am less provided with, than for any other part of my work. I am sensibly alive to all the delicacy of asking to see, much more to make use of a manuscript once intended for publication. But your friend and relative assured me, that your love for your country, your rigorous regard for truth, and your zeal for religion, would supersede all the delicacies and jealousies of

an author. You see Sir my pretensions in begging an interview and intercourse with you for some hours. I again renew my request, not from any *personal* views or considerations ; but purely, that I may omit nothing in my power to serve the cause of a nation, I love and esteem, and a religion I inflexibly adhere to.

I am fully aware of the falsities of every Protestant historian, that speaks of Ireland. I quote nothing from Cox but in refutation of himself and his party. I could not procure even a sight of the first edition of Curry with your grandfather's introduction, which I am very curious to see. It is not prefixed to the octavo edition of 1792. Having said so much, I have but to add, that for the sake of my clients (I so call on this occasion the Catholics of Ireland) not my own, I repeat my desire of a conference and a mutual communication of manuscripts in your neighbourhood, to give you as little trouble as possible. A little country air would afford me satisfaction and health. If your objection be against my coming into your neighbourhood, and you should not object to come to London, I take the liberty, for the sake of my clients, to offer to you a bed in my house in town, and a hearty welcome to our homely fare as long, as you will condescend to partake of it, and will with pleasure pay the expences of your journey to and fro. I entreat an early answer to this, and have the honor to be with great esteem,

Sir, your obedient humble Servant,

FRANCIS PLOWDEN.

To the Rev. Charles O'Connor, D.D.

Stowe, Bucks.

Your reply put a close to our correspondance in 1802.

Doctor O'
Conor's re-
ply.

SIR,

I return many thanks for your kind invitation, and more so for the very candid manner, in which you open to me

me your plan, and in which you express sentiments towards me, that are so personally flattering. It makes me feel, with more regret, than I otherwise should, that I am not qualified to give you the information you desire, and that upon this principle, I cannot accept of an invitation, which I could not be entitled to on any other.

It is true, that some years ago, at a period of extreme political intemperance, and when the minds of all our body were exceedingly agitated, I was induced to compile with a haste, that could only be justified by my good intentions, the *memoirs* you allude to. They never could be supposed to be a regular temperate and studied system of history. They were in fact little more, than historical anecdotes, rescued from the libels of such writers as Cox and Borlase. They were scarcely printed, when they were suppressed: for though I laboured to pursue the truth, I was soon sorry, that any copies had appeared. They were never published, and, with my consent they never shall.

The second part of them I am very glad to have withheld. *I sometime since gave them together with the originals* to the Marquis of Buckingham, who is possessed of the greatest part of my grandfather's papers, which consist chiefly of letters relating to the transactions of the Catholic Committee during a period of about 50 years.

They are now in his Lordship's library, together with the 1^o Irish MSS. annals of Cloan, compiled in the days of Marianus Scotus. 2^o MSS. annals of Innisfallen: a copy from the original in the Bodleian. 3^o MSS. annals of Boyle, a copy from the original in the British Museum. 4^o MSS. annals of Ulster, a copy from the MSS. of Arch-Bishop Laud in the Bodleian. 5^o the very autograph of the 4 masters—with a number of Irish MSS. Historical poems of *Coeman Flannus*, *Malmura* and other Bards and Genealogists, who

F preserved

preserved the succession of our kings and chieftains in the 9th, 10th, 11th and 12th centuries—also all the printed books, that have yet appeared upon this subject on the Continent, as well as in England and Ireland—by for the best collection in Europe.

This collection I could not without his Lordship's permission make use of in favour of any object, but that, for which it was collected, for it has cost him more trouble and expence than any other person ever yet incurred, to save our antiquities from a general wreck: and I could not without ingratitude and breach of trust meddle with his collection without his leave.

But even with his leave, it would cost me some months to give you the intelligence you require. I am ashamed to acknowledge, that even the most credited of our modern Irish writers cannot be depended upon, even with regard to leading facts. The more I examine, the more I find them guilty of the most perplexing anacronisms.

One should suppose, that Dr. Carpenter and the learned of his clergy together with my grandfather, Editors of the Irish edition of Butler's Lives, should have given accurately at least the leading facts and dates of the lives of the most celebrated of their Christian Kings, Bishops, Abbots, &c. for example, of such a celebrated Abbot as *Adamnan*. Now they do not state even, when he became Abbot of Hyona. Nor do I condemn them for it. They had not leisure nor materials. They found contradictory assertions in all the printed books, and they had not the originals.

Ware says, that Adamnan became Abbot of Hyona 670

Usher says in..... 679

Colgan says in..... 677

Possevin from Continental documents..... 690

Gesner from German documents..... 699

I could fill this sheet with such Chronological confusion.

One should suppose, that the above editors of Butler should be very clear in stating, when he was appointed Ambassador to Alfred king of Northumberland, and for what object or purpose, and by what King of Ireland, and yet compare what they state with the statement of Colgan—They say, that Adamnan was appointed Ambassador to Alfred by Longsech king of Ireland 701: Colgan says—“Anno Domini 684, and Finactœ regis Hybernix undecimo Adamnanus Abbas Hiensis Legatus missus venit &c. Colgan, vol 2. p. 499.

Smith says in his notes to Bede, Cambridge edition, that it is uncertain, when Adamnan was sent Ambassador to Alfred. Now Sir, if in such leading facts you find such inconsistencies in all the printed books, the consequence is plain, that we must have recourse to the originals, whenever we can find them—and try their merits, for this remains *yet to be done*, by the same rules of criticisms, by which we judge of the works of other times and of other nations.

Upon this principle Dr. Johnson and Mr. Burke called upon the Irish Academicians to publish their documents. Upon this principle at Lord Buckingham's request, I am endeavouring to connect from original and unpublished documents the ancient History of Ireland, and upon the same principles I took the liberty of referring you to documents certainly unpublished; and I really believe hitherto unexplored, in the Museum, the Bodleian, the Lambeth libraries. The documents in the State Paper Office will certainly be worth your best attention: and without a strict examination of these, and of many other original treasures of the same nature, I feel, that I could not venture to offer opinions upon our later Irish History, as connected with that of England: and every hour, that I have dedicated to the examination of our early history has confirmed me in my sense of the danger of assuming facts, without the maturest reflection, and the most indefatigable research.

I therefore must entreat, that you will not condemn me for declining the task you propose to me, as one, that in conscience I cannot accept, because I have not the *data* for it. But accept of my most cordial thanks and sincere proffer of friendship in any other way you may think consistent with the principles expressed in this letter.

I have the honor to be,

Sir, your most obliged humble Servant,

CHARLES O'CONOR.

Stowe, Feb. 18, 1802.

To Francis Plowden, Esq.

Essex-Street, London.

Now Reverend Sir and most learned Doctor, however displeased you may be, you cannot, I am confident, be extremely surprized, that I was not very highly gratified with the result of our correspondence. The latter effusion of your bile bespeaks the baseness and imbecility of character, which you had prefigured in the author of the Historical Review, when you attempted to impose upon him with such flimsy affectation of consequence, honor and conscience. So very unfavourable were the impressions worked by them upon my mind, that diffiding in my own judgment, I sent copies of your letters to the man, who best knew *you*, Reverend and most learned Doctor, who thus set your face against my undertaking, who was thoroughly acquainted with, and highly valued your common grandfather, who knows as well as any man existing the object, for which that collection was made by the
man

man, whose veracity you have so anxiously decried : he was a true Irishman, a real lover of that country, from which you have expatriated yourself. My future conduct in every thing, which related to you and the subject of our correspondence was regulated by his valuable testimony of your respectable grandfather's veracity and virtue. The whole of his letter is *national* matter, and therefore must be submitted to the nation whose interest the contents of it affect.

Coolavin, May 27, 1802.

Testimony
of Charles
O'Connor's
fidelity &
veracity.

MY DEAR SIR,

Your letter of the 12th Inst. with the inclosures, did not reach me until yesterday. I mention this circumstance, that you may believe, I lose no time in acknowledging the kindness of your communication. Of the correspondence between you and Dr. O'Connor I can with truth say, that it both disappointed and surprised me. I did not, I could not doubt, but that he would have treated you with a becoming liberality, and I was certain, that he would have displayed still greater alacrity to prosecute your work, than I did myself, because he possessed more the means of doing so. I now regret, that I exposed you to the trouble of making an unprofitable application ; but I regret still more to know, that our best and most copious collection of Irish books and manuscripts should be, as I fear they are, sunk for ever in the Sepulchral Library at Stowe, however splendid the monument, in which they are entomed. In future, I apprehend, they will be inaccessible to all but *the Priests of the Temple* ; nor will it be easy to come at them, even by *the Back Stairs*. When Dr. O'Connor left Ireland in the year 1799, he was a *real Irishman*. What he is at present I know not. He boasts of having divested himself of his *Irish prejudices*. If he ever had
any

any such, in an Irishman they were amiable and honourable ; and while not founded on voluntary error, I should feel more pride in avowing: than in disclaiming them. It would appear, that Dr. O'Connor has exchanged his Irish prejudices for the Anglo-Irish politicks of Stowe, and thus grafted a mongrel breed of mixed principles on the parent stock of Irish patriotism.

I must here protest against his unqualified rejection of allowing Irish authorities. There is an apparent heroism in his including his own grandfather in the number : but it is like the heroism of the man, who lest he should be at all suspected of superstition in religion, affected to repose his mind in universal scepticism.

Mr. Charles O'Connor devoted 60 years of his life to the study of Irish History and Irish Antiquities. He had the best collection of books, and understood the language better, than any man in Ireland. Left a widower in the 28th year of his age, possessed of an easy independent property, he had full leasure to indulge his favourite pursuits. He indulged these pursuits, therefore, from choice ; perhaps also from a laudable hope of not being wholly useless to his unhappy and injured country. He was neither stimulated by want, nor impelled by vanity to become an author. He was so modest, that though he always sought the company of men of letters, he was better pleased to hear the opinions of others, than to deliver his own. In his manners he was simple, in his conversation affable, in his temper rather cool, than ardent. In his convivial moments he was chearful in the highest degree, but his chearfulness never degenerated into levity. To this let me add, that he made religion a matter of conscience, and abhorred falsehood so much, that he would not hear an untruth even in jest. I do not therefore hesitate to affirm, that he was too sturdy a moralist, to prefer Ireland to truth. Such a man I consider safer as a guide, than his grandson, who has
not

not made Irish literature his particular study above 5 or 6 years, and who can be, but imperfectly acquainted with the ancient Irish language.

As for the documents you require for the history of the last century, it would be now doubly incumbent on me to furnish you with the most ample within my reach ; but my materials are scanty and scattered ; and I want skill to select what would be for your purpose, among a library of 2000 volumes there are but few on Irish History ; principally because my grandfather's books were always at my command. Some of my books Dr. O'Connor took with him to Stowe ; and I suppose they are lost in the general shipwreck. Many local Pamphlets on Irish affairs are dispersed in different trunks and boxes, so that I cannot at this moment lay my hands on them. A large library is not easily stowed in a cabin like mine. However I shall go through them all ; and in two or three posts shall send you a list of all my materials. You will yourself point out what you think may be of use to you, together with the mode of conveying them to London.

As you wish to see my grandfather's Introduction to Curry's Review, I shall transcribe it for you from his own Quarto copy in my possession, with his last original corrections. It is, I may say, the text, on which the Review is the comment. Dr. O'Connor says *it is not truth*. Since I received your letter I read it with attention, and find not an assertion in it, that can be *fairly* contradicted, nor a conclusion, that can be *justly* controverted. It bears the semblance of modest truth, as much as any disquisition I ever read. C'est le ton d'un homme qui aime la vérité ; et qui la trouve, ou croit l'avoir trouvée.

I am my dear Sir, yours most truly,
HUGH M'DERMOTT.

This letter was soon followed by another from my ever respectable friend, which goes to enhance his
OWN

own good wishes, and his grandfathers services to his country, counteracted, as far as you Reverend Doctor had it in your power, in all its objects.

Coolarvin, June 2, 1802.

MY DEAR SIR,

The promise I made in my letter of last week I here fulfill; to the scanty materials set down on the other side, I can only add, that I have also several manuscript papers of Mr. O'Connor, principally extracts from Irish books, or observations of his own on the history and antiquities of this county. These papers, together with the correspondence, I have not as yet looked over; and indeed I doubt my own competence to select from them what would be fit for your purpose. However, as you have already gone to press, would not any new matter come too late? Point out how I may be useful, and I shall neither spare my time nor my industry. You want matter principally for the History of the last century: but the History of Ireland from 1692 to 1782 was nearly a blank. No events of importance occurred, except the affair of St. Constantine Phipps, the enquiry into the royal grants in the time of King William; the parliamentary suppression of our Woollen manufacture, the violation of the conditions of Limerick, the Penal Laws in the reign of Queen Anne, the contest between the Irish and English Parliaments about the right of Judicature in that of the two first Georges, the disturbances of the White Boys and Hearts of Steel, during the commencement of the present reign, and the tardy, timid, irresolute steps taken by the Catholics from 1748 to 1778 to obtain even a mitigation of the Popery Laws. From 1778 to the Union you cannot be destitute or even barren of materials.

In my last I promised to transcribe for you the Introduction to the Historical Review; but I find it inserted in page 340 of

of the memoirs of Mr. O'Connor. But Dr. O'Connor by mistake gave it, as the Introduction to the Historical Memoirs by Curry, published in 1758; whereas it was only prefixed to the Historical Review in 1775. The marginal corrections in Mr. O'Connor's printed copy of the Introduction relate principally to inaccuracies of style, and are therefore not worth sending to you.

Should your present Work meet that reception from the publick, which I am certain it will deserve, I shall indulge a hope of seeing it hereafter expand from a *cursor survey* into a *regular history*. I know not why an History of Ireland, if well executed, should not be as popular a book in England, as a History of Scotland, which the names of Robertson and Stuart have placed on every shelf. I do not hesitate to say, that I should be better pleased to see such a Work come from *your hand*, than from that of *any Irishman*. Nor do I know any other native of Great Britain, whose abilities, learning, candour and political liberality equally qualify for such an undertaking. If you should ever think *seriously* of realising my hopes in this respect, it must bring you to Ireland, where I shall request you to consider this house as your own. All the books and papers, which I possess or can procure, shall be at your command, fully, freely and without reserve. In this I pay you no compliment; I only render my country perhaps the only service, it may ever in my power to render her.

I am, with great esteem and regard,

Dear Sir,

Your's ever

HUGH M'DERMOTT.

This letter contains a list of the following pamphlets (amongst others) in the possession of Dr. M'Dermott.

Seasonable thoughts relative to Ireland, Dublin, 1751 by Mr. O'Connor.

G

Case

Case of the Roman Catholicks 1755, by ditto.

Maxims relative to the State of Ireland 1757, by ditto.

Counter Appeal to the People of Ireland, Dublin 1749, by ditto.

The Protestant Interest of Ireland considered, Dublin 1757, by ditto.

Lord Taaffe's Observations on the Affairs of Ireland, Dub. 1767, by ditto.—Lord Taaffe set his name to it.

Letter from Mr. O'Connor to Mr. Hume on the War of 1641, (manuscript.)

Also several hundred of original letters on Irish History and Irish Antiquities, which passed between Mr. O'Connor and the following persons.

Letters to and from Mr. O'Connor, and

Lord Lyttleton,

Ralph Ousley,

Dr. Johnson,

Mrs. Soley, an English Lady,

Dr. Leland,

Dr. Warner,

Colonel Vallancey,

Mervyn Archdall,

Dr. Curry,

Dr. Carpenter,

George Faulkner,

Michael Reilly,

Chevalier O Gorman,

James O Moore,

Joseph Cooper Walker,

Mr. Vesey,

Gorges Edmond Howard,

Mr. Whitton, and many others.

N. B. The originals are all in my possession.

One other letter, Reverend Sir and most learned Doctor, I received from your worthy brother-in-law, that inflexible patriot Dr. M'Dermott, which will complete my evidence, to prove, that I have *not* permitted myself *to be misguided by the foreign influence men, the Castabalas of your native country*, of which you claim a right to complain. Your assumption of that right imposes upon me the indispensable obligation

ligation of negating your charge, which nothing short of the unimpeachable authority of your brother-in-law could have convicted you, or convinced your seduced proselytes of the flippant falsehoods and dangerous errors, which it has become my duty to shew, are contained in your four letters, under the signature *Columbanus*.

Coolavin, August 18, 1802.

DEAR SIR,

Your letter of the 5th Inst. reached me on Saturday last. I find by it (what I expected) that you were *disappointed* at the scantiness of the little parcel, which you received. The letters and other manuscript papers were not *my property*, they belonged to Dr. O'Connor, who left them in my care. To part with them without his consent would be a violation of private confidence. I mentioned to you, that if, on a more enlarged prospect, you should ever come to Ireland, and favoured me with a visit; these and every other material I could command or collect, should be fully and freely at your disposal. I can not, nor do I conceive myself warranted to do more. Of Dr. O'Connor's refusal to supply you with the very ample historical documents in his possession I have already expressed my open disapprobation. But though I may censure, I have no right to controul. Nor would the want of a becoming liberality in him justify a breach of trust in me. From several hundred letters and papers now in this house, to extract any thing material for your purpose would require more time, than I can command, and more abilities, than I possess. I could not discriminate properly. I feel myself unequal to make a judicious selection. I often regretted and still regret, that I had not those papers with me, when I had the pleasure of seeing you at Booterstown.

In your present important and arduous undertaking I am sorry to find you have had so few helps. We do not deserve, that you should labour for us. You are left to tug at the oar, as well as to guide the helm: but your merit will be the greater, in conquering difficulty by your own exertions. As for my part I must remind you, that the beggar can only give his mite. He, who is poor himself cannot enrich his neighbour. I regret having had so little help to send you; but I cannot reproach myself with having sent less, than I ought.

I am, Dear Sir, with great esteem,
and best wishes, yours most truly,

HUGH M'DERMOTT.

The same
subject
continued.

No further correspondence was carried on between Dr. M'Dermott and me, until the *Historical Review* had made it's appearance before the public; and I then wrote to him a letter, of which the following extract will bespeak the consistency of my views and the earnestness of my efforts to serve your country.

Essex-Street 22, August 1803.

MY DEAR FRIEND,

The late interruption of our correspondence I know you will attribute to the true cause on my part; namely, the labour of finishing my Work and the subsequent application to dispatch such things, as it had interrupted. You, who knew from the first conception the nature and spirit, in which it was engendered, will not be astonished, that its birth has displeased the men in power, because it has heinously offended the Orangemen. They have been loud in their complaints of the freedom, with which I have exhibited their system, and Mr. Wickham told me the day before he left London,

London, that Government could not be expected to encourage the circulation of a Work, that spoke so harshly of the persons, to whom they looked up for the salvation of the country. You may remark, that the great influence of the present Administration is all *Orange*.

These documents, reasons and grounds existed before 1803 for my writing the *Historical Review* in the spirit, and upon the authorities, which I did. You Reverend Doctor were not then, to my knowledge at least, before the public: and however I reprobated and contemned your conduct, I was not called upon to notice you in any part of my publications. You recurred not seriously to my thoughts until 1805, when a friend of yours put into my hands a reprint of your *Prospectus*, which had without my having been aware of it, been published in Dodsley's Annual Register for 1803. I do not dissemble, that the lecture of it forced upon my mind many extraordinary and painful impressions. I reflected on the time, at which you, Reverend Doctor, (for from you it came) sent to Dodsley for publication, as it appeared in 1802, that excellent letter of the late Mr. Burke to Gen. Vallancey, calling upon him to favor the world with a literal translation of some of the old Irish Annals; in which he says. "*But if any accident should happen to you and to Mr. O'Connor (your worthy grandfather) what security have we, that any other like you should start up.*" I considered, that it was
your

Columbanus reprints
Dodsley's
Prospectus
in 1805.
It's effects.

your preparation of the public mind, for that elaborate and exquisitely precious *Morceau* of anticipated Review and panegyric by the author of his own unwritten Work, which appeared in the next number of Dodsley's Annual Register for 1803. I combined the times of those publications with the corresponding dates of your correspondence with Dr. M'Dermott in the autumn of 1801, and with me in February 1802. I passed in my mind the laudable views of your patriotic grandfather, in making the best collection of materials of any in Europe for writing Irish History: and contrasted them against the degenerate grandson, who had entombed them in the sepulchral library of Stowe. You Reverend and most learned Doctor, have crammed your four letters to your countrymen with a farraginous batch of learning, some of which makes for you, much of it against you; some parts of which establish premises, from which you draw unfair conclusions, other parts of which falsify your assertions, defeat your arguments, and stultify your boasts: and a very considerable portion of which convicts you of arrogance to your spiritual superior, malignity to your opponents, and untruth to all men. I shall for the sake of other readers of this letter besides the person, to whom it is addressed, endeavour to proceed with proper attention to the *lucidus Ordo*; a movement not frequently resorted to in your tactics.

After

After I had read in 1805, what you had procured to be inserted in the successive numbers of Dodsley's Annual Register for 1802 and 1803, I published nothing concerning Ireland, till I brought forth the history already mentioned to have been so graciously received by the Prince of Wales ; though now under Lord Eldon's injunction in England. I perceived you preparing for battle from afar, against your country, your kindred, and the religion of your countrymen. You were making yourself a public man by long anticipation, laying in your pretensions to a name and reputation in life, though at an interminable distance.* “ Some time, you say, must necessarily elapse before this great national Work can be completed. Of the transcripts and latin translations of the 5 first Articles, part is already in the press, and much progress has been made in decyphering, translating and collating several of the documents under the sixth. It is therefore to be hoped, that the period is not far distant, when Dr. O'Connor will be able to look for the reward of his labours, in the gratification of having contributed to that general mass of national information, which *for succeeding centuries has been*, one of the most interesting and proudest ornaments of the British Empire.” Now Reverend and most learned Doctor, maugre your early lust for *unhybernizing* yourself

Doctor O'Connor's long anticipated views of becoming a public man.

* *Rerum Hyberuicarum* &c. apud Dodsley for 1803, sub. fin.

yourself,* *the review of an unwritten Work*, and the gratification in what *has been the pride of succeeding generations*, savour so strongly of what we English (I admit very unwarrantably) call *hybernisms*, that you should repent having washed off the paint, which might have still concealed these disgusting wrinkles.

Columbanus' allusions retorted upon himself.

I am here naturally induced to acknowledge my obligations for your Reverence's having so kindly forewarned me of the fate of the Sicilian poet. Though my classical lamp be nearly exhausted, your reference to Horace has fed the wick with a momentary flame, that will probably be instantly extinguished for ever more. Surely the quotation fits the quoter more appositely than Leland, or the author of the *Historical Review*. No matter whom it fits: a bibliothecarian, who could not quote might remain for ever *uninvigorated and uncheered by the warm beams of munificent patronage*. Allow me, without offence, to figure you most learned Doctor relaxing from your graver pursuits, with a Horace in lieu of Quesnell before you, recognizing in the strong etching of that master of the art of poetry a character, of which you fancied you did and ought to know much, and of which in reality you knew but little. Then without judgment, reflection, or discrimination you flippantly apply it (*sicut tuus est mos*) to one, of which you were utterly ignorant. You Sir, are the
Emphedocles

* The Author knows not how long before the 11th of Feb. 1802, Columbanus gratified this strange passion.

Empedocles, that wished *Deus immortalis haberi*. But why in such precipitation to immortalize yourself upon advanced credit? Even posthumous fame should satisfy the man, whose gratified peep into futurity remunerates the information he has given to his country, and which *for succeeding generations has been the pride of the British Empire*. Before you had published *Columbanus*, I was at a loss fully to account for your writing at all. I had indeed observed the indignity offered by you to your grandfather's ashes. I had marked your profane removal of consecrated boundaries: and since those publications it could have escaped the notice of few, that you raved like a ferocious animal broken loose from confinement.

Nec satis apparet, cur versus factitet: utrum
Minxerit in patrios cineres, an triste bidental
Moverit incestus: certe furit: ac velut ursus
Objectos caveæ valuit si frangere* clathros.

Nor is it plain for what more horrid crime
The Gods have plagued him with the curse of rhyme.
Whether his father's ashes he disdained,
Or hallow'd ground with sacrilege profaned.
Certain he's mad: and like a baited bear
If he had strength enough his den to tear.

Fran. Hor. Art of Poetry.

* The secluded Scholar in pursuit of recondite knowledge may not, perhaps, be heedless of Etymon. This latin word the Romans borrowed from the Greek word *clethra*; whence probably the French *cloitre* and our *cloyster*, generally applied to places

Why Dr.
O'Connor
noticed in
the Authors
Introduc-
tion to the
History of
Ireland.

From the moment of your affecting a public character, by the rules of history I was summoned *to explain your general conduct and character*. You had not then played the theologian, nor conjured up the shade of Columbanus, § in order to marshal your countrymen to fierce resistance to the *uncanonical* (as you term them) *proceedings of Popes and Synods*. In my dissertation upon the antiquity of Irish History, † I found it necessary to take notice of you

places of religious retirement; and more largely to colleges and seminaries, where individuals live and are maintained in community, and bind themselves by vows and oaths to obedience and rule. I understand Dr. Columbanus was gratuitously educated at Rome on a Papal foundation for the specific purpose of serving the Irish mission, under sworn obedience to his Spiritual Superior the Bishop of Elphin.

§ “No; with the blessing of God, the great Columbanus shall not have appeared to us in vain. We shall yet have a National Church.”
4. Col. 12, 13.

*Falsus honor juvat & mendax infamia terret,
Quem nisi mendosum & mendacem?*

Hor. Ep. 2.

Whom but the man of error and untruth,
Doth borrow'd honor please, doth lying shame appal?

This is my motto to the Historical letter to Sir Richard Musgrave.

† It would be disingenuous to offer as reasons or proofs for assertions made by me in 1809, facts or circumstances, of which I only acquired the knowledge in 1810. It was impossible for me, not gifted alas! with Mr. Dodsley's *præscientia de futuris contingentibus*, to anticipate the disgust, hatred and indecency, with which throughout your four letters you have treated

you and of your grandfather's collection of books and manuscripts, and to make several assertions, which it remains for me now to shew I have not, as you charge, *made without proofs*. You certainly have

H 3

fortunately

treated the christian Primate, the Catholic Hierarchy of your own country, and the generality of the Catholic priesthood throughout the British Empire. I certainly traced symptoms of envy, petulance and little malice in your observations upon Dr. Carpenter, (the late C. A. B. of Dublin) and the learned of his clergy, with your grandfather, whom you speak of (unwarrantably I believe) as the editors of the Irish edition of Butler's lives of Saints. How could the particular time, at which Adamnan became Abbot of Hyona, or went as ambassador to Alfred, interest me, who had commenced a general historical review of Irish History from a period later by centuries, than his existence? This wanton and spiteful kick at the credit of Dr. Carpenter and the learned of his clergy, and the base second attack upon your grandfather's want of accuracy and truth were not only irrelevant to the subject of your letter to me, but foully stained by a frontless and senseless falsehood. Meanly and unnaturally striving to raise an hatchment of self consequence upon the parricidal pyle of your grandfather's mangled fame for veracity, you unblushingly associate him (I still think unwarrantably) with the editors of Butler's lives, *who had not the original materials for accuracy*, when you tell us as the fact was, that your grandfather then living had by far the best collection of original materials in Europe for writing Irish History: and he was one of the co-editors, as you say. Little however did your revered ancestor's intuition into futurity prefigure the degenerate hand, that was so soon to alienate the invaluable treasure from his family, his country and the patriotic purposes, for which he had collected it.

fortunately for your countrymen, by your late publications disclosed more of your character, than you had by your review of a Work in embryo, and therefore I said to them in my last history, *Hunc tu Romane caveto*: but nothing from any of *Columbanus*' letters, the first of which came out in 1810, could have influenced or authorized me to make assertions in my Historical Dissertation, which was published in August 1809. I certainly did there assert, that if the *prospectus* (*Review* you call it) could only have come from your pen or instructions, that the reprint of it in 1805 was the more to be relied upon, as proceeding from the fountain head of the best information on the subject: "that after the death of the great Mr. O'Connor, (you) Dr. Conor his grandson, became possessed of the valuable collection of manuscripts and all the printed books upon this subject on the Continent, as well as in England and Ireland, by far the best collection in Europe. That it had passed (no matter to the public for what consideration) from Dr. O'Connor to the Marquis of Buckingham: and as Mr. Burke says, is now lurking in the library of Stowe; and lying in the hands of an individual, who appears to enhance the value of his purchase by rendering it inaccessible" That whatever I had added to what you Reverend Doctor, had thought fit to bring forward in the Review of your embryo Work, was "upon the authority of the grandson, ere yet *vendidit hic auro patriam*. That according

according to Lord Littleton, "Your grandfather
 "with the noble blood, that flowed in his veins had
 "naturally inherited a passionate love for the honor
 "of his country, and therefore willingly assisted
 "in any undertaking, that might render the history
 "of it more known and more complete.* Many
 of the proofs of these assertions appear on the face
 of the letters already submitted to the reader: to
 any one harbouring a doubt I recommend an atten-
 tive revisal of them.

Besides the internal evidence of the contents of the Review, which could only have proceeded from the author of it (who else could know his intentions or ascertain the plan and progress of a work more in thought, than in hand?) numerous and pregnant are the proofs of their having come from you. In my Historical Letter to Sir Richard Musgrave (he strongly resembles you in traducing his countrymen and abusing the author of the *Historical Review*) I observed, as I now do to you, his cooperator in the same cause, (*par nobile fratrum*,) that, the manner "spirit and stile of an author are to the close ob-
 "server fully as distinguishable, as the character
 "and manner of handwriting, to which evidence
 "upon oath is constantly taken in courts of Justice,
 "ice,

* The reader is apprized, that so much of the dissertation would not have been quoted; but that with the perpetual injunction outstanding, the work can be but in few hands: perhaps not even in those of the Reverend and most learned Doctor.

Doctor O'
 Conor as-
 similated
 to Sir Rd.
 Musgrave.

“ice.”* One manner of diction pervades your private

* “Four strongly marked peculiarities distinguish Sir Richard Musgrave’s productions (page 6.) 1°. Effrontery in denying truth. 2°. Malignity in adopting falsehood. 3°. Hatred to his countrymen and execration of their religion, and 4°. Self adulation to nauseating disgust.” Few are the philosophers as well known to themselves as to others : the likeness between the most learned Doctor and the truth hunting Baronet is closer, than either of them is perhaps aware of. One vein of ribaldry, abuse and buffoonry flows from the pen of each. Both are so surcharged with bilious acrimony, that they scatter it indiscriminately on friend and foe. The same *Charlatanerie gauche* has beguiled each of them into the besotted consciousness of remaining undiscovered, whilst under the masked battery of some creditable publication they disgust the reader, and disgrace the writer by praising themselves and abusing others. Columbanus, fighting under the same banners, (though in a private corps) with his *sunergoi* Dr. Duigenan and Sir Richard Musgrave, who wrote what the Reverend compiler of the *Anti-Jacobin* published, and who also is in the pay of the same foe to Ireland, forgot, that the real author could be unmasked ; and fondly fancied, that the respectable name of Mr. Dodsley would conceal from notice the extraordinary assumptions of transcendent merit from his own pen. I am particularly obliged to him for the sublime effort of his dignified charge upon *my* antagonist ; for the objectionable passages in the *Anti-Jacobin* are aimed at the author of the *Historical Review*. (1. *Columbanus ad Hybernos* 27) “ No man
“ has more grossly or more illiberally abused the Catholic
“ religion, than this very *Saint Cobbett*, except it should be
“ that classical and polite countryman of ours Dr. Duigenan,
“ who is said to be the son of a Catholic priest, or that most
“ elegant

private letters and your public review, as will appear
by

“elegant and most holy divine, the compiler of the *Anti-*
“*Jacobin*, who rails at the religion of the *Jeroms*, the *Augustines*,
“the *Bedes*, the *Calmet*s, the *Montfaucons*, the *Petaviuses*,
“the *Pascals*, and the *Mabillons* with as much ease to him-
“self, as *Punch* does, when he pulls up the waistband of his
“breeches to prove, that *Newton* d——n him was a coxcomb,
“and *Copernicus* a fool! *Eccolo vero Poncinello!*

In 1805 I certainly did charge Sir Richard Musgrave with
being the writer and publisher under cover of the British
Critic of the following *self puff*. “The author (i e Sir Richard
“Musgrave) has completely succeeded in detecting and expos-
“ing the insidious attempts of Mr. P. to arraign the wisdom,
“the justice and humanity of the British Government, and in
“doing this he has displayed so profound a knowledge of the
“English and Irish history, so sound a judgment, and such
“accuracy of discrimination, joined to great elegance of
“style, that his very excellent Work must be considered as a
“valuable addition to the libraries of persons of taste and
“rational curiosity.” With like confidence in 1812, do I
charge the Reverend and most learned Doctor O’Conor
soidisant Columbanus with having written and published under
cover of Dodsley’s Annual Register, the following modest
sketch of his own value and merit. “That the warm beams
“of munificent patronage, happily in the present instance
“have not been withheld, but have been employed with a
“generous profusion in calling forth the abilities of Doctor
“O’Conor into light and activity, thereby conferring on
“Ireland in particular, and the antiquarian and scholar of eve-
“ry clime the most weighty obligations. He was fortunate
“enough to find in the Rev. Doctor O’Conor, the grandson
“of the late Charles O’Conor, Esq. of Balanagre in the
“county of Roscommon, a gentleman qualified by his superior
“knowledge of the Irish language and indefatigable industry,
“to

by comparison. The same arrogant assumption of consequence, the same boast of science, the same exclusive pretensions to veracity. The like ostentatious display of biblical advantages (God knows how acquired!), the like contemptuous defiance of those, who are excluded from them, the like puff of pretension, the like exuberance of profession, and every where equal defect of performance. Almost ten years have elapsed, you say, since the Work is gone to press; and nothing has yet appeared. *De non apparentibus & non existentibus eadem ratio.* The munificence, pride and judgment of the marquis of Buckingham in forming an Irish library (*the most complete that exists*) is the theme of your Review, as well as of your private letters.

You
 “to remove from a great and high spirited people the imputation of being unacquainted with their own annals, at a time, when even the Icelanders have published theirs. In the grandson of the latter has been found, the worthy inheritor and able representative of the peculiar attainments of his progenitor.”

In 1805 I said to the bashful trumpeter of his own renown, (Let to Musg. 95) “The Ostrich in concealing its foolish head supposes its body concealed from view. Thus you Sir Richard behind the doublings of your fivefold helmet, fancy yourself as secure from detection, as was the anonymous Gaul within the Iron-Mask. You may now raise up the visor. You are as distinguishable as the posteriors of the ostrich. As I know you, I address you.” In 1812 I have little more to add, to the unblushing Herald of his own attainments, industry and exploits *to be achieved*.

You assured me, "that in writing your suppressed volume of Historical Anecdotes rescued from the libels of such writers as Cox and Borlase, you laboured to pursue the truth" but you do not deny, that you found it. Why should good intentions either compell or justify haste? The Work certainly was any thing but a *regular* and *studied* system of history: but it bears no shade of *intemperance*, and it has the transcendent advantage over all your subsequent productions; the judgment of those, who have read it, coincides with your avowal, that you pursued the truth (and not in vain). Whereas in every subsequent publication from the eulogized Review of your plans and intentions in Dodsley to the fourth letter of *Columbanus ad Hybernos*, they find much falsehood, *notwithstanding you prefer truth to every species of elegance and eloquence: Rien nest beau que le vrai.* We lament a deplorable dereliction of truth, but discover not the *elegance* or *eloquence*, to which she has been sacrificed. When I read in your solitary *Work of truth* the glowing and splendid description of the flower of your grandfather's library, followed by a partial repetition of it in your private letter to me in February 1802, and soon after again displayed in the anticipated Review of your projected labours in Mr. Dodsley's honoured deviation from his usual mode and established rule of *reviewing only published articles*, was it possible to arrive at any other conclusion, than that the three several specifications

Proofs of
Doctor O'
Conor's
being the
Author of
Review in
Dodsley.

cations of materials came from one pen? Sure I was, that the only man on earth, who knowing your revered grandfather could have the hardy-hood to decry his veracity, was he, who knowing any thing of the grandson, could have had the modesty to assure the public,* that *in the grandson of the latter has been found the worthy inheritor and able representative of the peculiar attainments of his progenitor: and that the munificent patronage (of the Marquis of Buckingham) had been employed with a generous profusion in calling forth the abilities of (YOU) Dr. O'Connor into light and activity: thereby conferring on Ireland in particular, and the antiquarian and scholar of every clime the most weighty obligation.*

Transfer of
the O'Connor
collection from
Connaught
to Stowe.

Although, Reverend and most 'learned Doctor, both in writing and reading this hyberbolical sublimation of your powers and virtues, *the pultrahou beat high at your heart,*† it was not so precisely with him, whose historical duty it was, to weigh the comparative pretensions of grandsire and grandson in that scale of even justice, experience and judgment furnished by my valuable friend, the real inheritor of his grandfather's virtue and veracity. I certainly stood aghast, when I reflected, that Ireland had been in a very mysterious manner despoiled of that superb armoury, which your patriotic grandfather

* Dods. Anl. Reg. for 1803.

† 4 Let. 96.

father had spent his valuable life in collecting, as Lord Lyttleton observed, from a passionate love for the honor of his country, and his willing assistance in any undertaking to render the history of it more known or more complete, that they had been forced into the impenetrability of Stowe, dragged like the flower of Alcides's herd by the tail into Cacus' den, that their progress from Conaught to Buckinghamshire might be unobserved, and neither retraced nor recovered even by Herculean power.

Atque hos, ne qua forent pedibus vestigia rectis,
Cauda in Speluncam tractos, versisque viarum
Indiciis raptos, saxo occultabat opaco.

And lest the printed footsteps might be seen,
He dragged them backwards to his rocky den.
The tracks averse a lying notice gave,
And led the searcher backwards from the cave.

Dryd. Virg. VIII. Æn.

For some time indeed, that is, till I had been accidentally referred to you for documents for recent Irish history, little was it suspected, *that the greatest part of your grandfather's papers, which consist chiefly of letters relating to the transactions of the Catholic Committee during a period of about 50 years, were to be traced to the inaccessible shelves of Stowe.*

Quærentem nulla ad speluncam signa ferebant.

At last kind Providence brought to light the repository of these interesting documents of the last
I 2 century

century, little connected alas! with the ancient Irish annals, *almost as obsolete and obscure, as those of Persepolis*, as you described them to me in 1802, and in your search after truth, (the suppressed volume,) with more studied emphasis, *so obscure, that it would seem, as if time had forbidden a discovery.*

Panditur extemplo foribus domus atra revulsis
Abstractæque boves, abjuratæque rapinæ
Cælo ostenduntur.

The doors unbarr'd receive the rushing day,
And thorough lights disclose the ravished prey, &c.

Dryd. Virg. 8 Æn.

I was then evidently authorized (rather obliged) to inform the public,* that “ Co-operators with Dr. O’Conor in the wish to elucidate Irish history, have already found the access to his grandfather’s collection impossible. Whatever light must in future be thrown upon Irish literature and history from this collection, will be dealt out to the public according to the liberality, openness, and communicative disposition of the Noble purchaser and his representatives.” In the genuine spirit of the back-stairs juggle and the Pitt tactics, against the investigation, disclosure, and pursuit of truth, were set up the private will and conscience of the great man, as the subterfuge, justification, and indemnity, for the misdeeds of the little one. *I therefore must entreat, that you will not condemn me for declining the task*
you

* 1 Hist. of Ireland, p. 137.

*you propose to me, as one, that in conscience I cannot accept, because I have not the data for it. This collection I could not, without his Lordship's permission, make use of in favor of any object, but that, for which it was collected. Now, Rev. and most learned Doctor, and most observant of truth, allow for once what the public will believe to be the truth. Your tender conscience was not pressed to refuse me the sight of your grandfather's papers relating to the transactions of the Catholic Committee for want of *data*, but for want of *will*. Did you not also warn Dr. M'Dermott to keep from me the few documents, that remained in his custody, and which may perhaps have escaped the general shipwreck? In these, I presume your Mæcenas claimed no property. They were not amongst the *data* to him: though they were a part of the valuable documents, which your grandfather had collected for the assistance of those, who wished to render the history of the country more known and more complete.**

I

* I mean not to question or impeach the Marquis of Buckingham's legal right or property in this collection: but it is a known truth, that whilst Mr. Charles O'Connor lived, many persons, who had in their possession curious books, papers or documents, either gave or sold them to him. It was the general prepossession of his countrymen, that a collection in the hands of a man of his ability and will to use it for the benefit of his country, was really a national archive to be kept in the country, and made accessible to all, who might wish to perfect its History. The O'Connor collection would perhaps never

I unquestionably did, in 1809, insert in my dissertation
 have been made, certainly not so enlarged by individual contributions, had it been known, that so soon after the death of that wise, virtuous, and patriotic collector it would have been doomed to perpetual exile, and buried in eternal darkness to those, whom it was formed to illumine, *solis inaccessam radiis*. Mr. O'Connor in the preface to the second edition of his Dissertation on the History of Ireland, (Dub. 1766) informs us, that he gave that second edition *as soon as the materials were put into his hands for additions and amendations*. Since the bloom of youth has passed from the face of Columbanus, and he has now more time to enquire, than he then had, into the truth of his grandfather's dissertations, I must presume his conversion to be the effect of long, intense, and impartial investigation: and as he tells the public, (4 Col. 40) *that his opinions in private agree with his printed books*, I may fairly conclude, from his frequently quoting the Greek and Roman Poets, that he is more ambitious of being thought conversant with them, than with Coleman Flannus, Malmura, or any of his own country bards. It would be impossible in those moments of impartial contemplation upon the original formation of this national treasure, the object of its collection, and the actual application of it after the collector's death, that the lines of Flaccus should not, even in the closet of the *recondite scholar*, have replaced the washed off paint for some moments of conscious remorse and confusion.

Quid faciam si furtum fecerit, aut si
 Prodiderit Commissa fidei, sponsumve negarit?
 Queis paria esse fere placuit peccata, laborant
 Cum ventum ad verum est: Sensus moresque repugnant:

What if he robb'd me, or his trust betrayed,
 Or broke the sacred promise he had made?
 Who hold all crimes alike, are deep distress
 When we appeal to truth's impartial test.
 Sense, custom, social good, from whence arise
 All forms of right and wrong, THE FACT DENIES.

Fra. Hor. Sat. 3. L. 1.

sertation upon the antiquity of Irish history, the following note, p. 140. "Having intimated in a former note, that this collection is now inaccessible to those, who wish to authenticate and verify matters in Irish history, it is fitting to inform the reader, that whatever is here said of it, is upon the authority of the Rev. grandson, ere yet, *Vendidit hic Auro patriam.*" These I admit to be hard words: and the proofs, which authorized me to use them, are obvious and conclusive. Where valuable property is transferred for valuable consideration, a sale takes place, whatever disguise, color or pretext may be resorted to, in order to constitute the transaction, any thing but a sale. I find you three times boasting of the possession of the most valuable property (of its nature) in Europe; in your work of truth, (the suppressed volume,) your letter to me, and your review (under Dodsley's name and prescience,) of a work, hardly hatched in your brain. You ascertain a *legal* (whether rightful or *tortious* I know not) possession in this collection. *I sometime since gave them together with the originals to the Marquis of Buckingham,* "who is possessed of the greatest part of my grandfather's papers, which consist chiefly of letters relating to the transactions of the Catholic Committee during a period of about 50 years." The boasted gift of the greatest part of your grandfather's papers, where you make no diversity in the title to the rest, which are now in his Lordship's Library

Proofs of
Doctor O'
Conor's
sale of the
collection.

brary, evidently proves the mode of acquisition, or legal purchase of undisputed property, by your patron, when you tell me it has cost more *trouble* (which I care not about) and *expence*, than any other person ever yet incurred to save our antiquities from a general wreck. You announce, under the name of Dodesley, to the public, that Lord Buckingham has *with a generous profusion invigorated and cheered you*, (Rev. and most learned Dr. O'Connor) *with the warm beams of munificent patronage*. You redundantly repeat * that this English Nobleman has given (I forego

* I lay aside the consideration of the trouble you give your patron credit for having incurred in making the collection, the only criterion of which could have been your firmness in resisting the temptation to renounce your Irish prejudices, to decry the veracity of your grandfather, to withdraw by the tail (*cauda in speluncam tractor*) the patriotic fruits of his meritorious life, to abandon the Evangelical labours in the vineyard of Elphin, which you by oath had engaged to serve for life. On that memorable day to you the most awful of your life, the day of your ordination in the Church of St. John Lateran (3 Col. 7) you received Orders *titulo missionis*, which subjected you to a special oath of obedience to your diocesan Bishop. How could you expect any rational man to believe you, when you extolled the unprecedented trouble of the Marquis of Buckingham in making a collection, which was ready formed to his hand by your grandfather, and which you gave (actually *sold*) to him. The object, for which I applied to you for your grandfather's papers of the proceedings of the Catholic committee for 50 years, was to give to the public a full fair and undisguised history of those

forego his motives,) more attention and *expence* to collect from “ every quarter in both Islands the originals

times. In 1802 you told me, you could not without his Lordship's permission make use of this collection in favour of *any object but that, for which it was collected*, (i.e. by his Lordship, whose trouble and expence in collecting you so highly appreciate): does not your refusal on this ground import an object directly the reverse? Namely, to give to the public either none, or an imperfect, biassed, and distorted history of your country? Such was the mandate of the new possessor of the treasure, who, *magna se mole ferebat*. Did not the jackall's prohibition to allow me the use of the offals of the great prey left in Conaught, confirm these very views and intentions? They were again recognized and acted upon, when soon after your appointment to be a private chaplain to your patron's lady in Dublin, the whole (as you thought) of the impression of the first volume, and ten sheets of the second volume, were for the direct purpose of suppressing the truth of Irish history, thrust into a privy, which communicated with the Poddle in Dublin, and were thence carried into the Liffey under the Old Custom House. This was washing off the paint with a vengeance: this was the first fruit of your conversion. Let your countrymen compare this newly purchased zeal of the grandson with the native spirit of the grandsire, who foreseeing a possibility of suppressing and abusing what he had collected, lamented, *that all might be strangers to the whole matter in another age*. (Pref. to Diss.) He says in his Dissertation, p. 7. *These have but a bad chance to outlive another generation*. He anticipates even a less misfortune, than that, which has actually befallen them. *Like the weapons of the ancients in a royal armoury they will barely remain to be looked at, never to be taken down for use*. (Pref. to Diss. xix.) After having completed the second amended editions of the Dissertation, and added to it “ A dissertation on the first emigra-

“ ginals and faithful transcripts of all the known
 “ most antient documents tending to illustrate its
 “ history

“ tions and final settlement of the Scots in North Britain, with
 “ occasional observations on the poems of *Fingal* and *Temora*,”
 with the full weight of all, that he had done for the honour and
 utility of his country, and what he wished to be done, your vir-
 tuous grandfather patriotically and wisely remarked (p. 64).
 “ Much is still to be investigated on this subject, and by abler
 “ hands: not indeed from the low principle, which gratified sil-
 “ ly curiosity, or a sillier vanity; but from a desire to disco-
 “ ver as much as can be discovered of a people, who had arts
 “ of civilization *of their own*, and manners, which however
 “ barbarous *to us*, yet inferred and produced also a cultivation
 “ of the human mind.”

Behold the genuine, the admirable sentiments, the Irish feel-
 ings of your patriotic grandsire. I will not, with the pagan
 poet grossly transplant the pleasures of the stable and sports of
 the field into Elysium,

Quæ gratia curruum

Armorumque fuit vivis, quæ cura nitentes
 Pascere equos, eadem sequitur tellure repostos.

The love of horses, which they had alive,
 And care of chariots after death survive

Dryd. Virg. 6. Æn.

But I will address you, Reverend and most learned Doctor,
 as a Roman Catholic Priest: and with my catechism I learnt to
 pay profound respect to that dignified character, which I have
 often heard described, so weightily, that angels might stagger
 under it, *onus Angelicis humeris formidandum*. As a heathen
 I might upbraid you with thwarting and persecuting the *manes*
 of your ancestor, even to the seat of bliss. I have no doubt,
 but that you have often instructed your flock at *Castlereagh*, as
 I have been taught elsewhere, that the fundamental ground of

“history prior to its connection with England, and
 “having formed an Irish Library, perhaps the most
 “complete that exists, he was fortunate enough to
 “find in the Rev. Doctor O’Conor.”—What and
 whom? The full O’Conor collection, and the man,
 who exercised the right of giving away the greater
 part of it (*ab actu ad potentiam valet consequentia*),
 and who by his three times repeated rehearsal, has
 shown, that his grandfather’s collection (*and nothing*
 K 2 *(else*

belief necessary to justify the Catholic usage of invoking the
 saints and angels in heaven to pray and intercede to God for
 us, is, that the blessed in heaven know what passes here on
 earth. Although the *National Church* of England hold the book
 of Tobias to be one of the Apocrypha, (you of course hold it
 to be canonical) yet it recommends it to be read *for example of*
life, and instruction of manners, (6th Art. of Rel.) and there we
 read (Tob. xii. 15.) *Raphael one of the seven, which assist before*
the Lord, said unto Tobias, when thou didst pray with tears, and
didst bury the dead by night, I offered thy prayer to the Lord.” Now,
 Rev. Sir, allow me without offence to pick up and *put on* some
 of your *cast off* Irish prejudices, and to suppose, that your vir-
 tuous grandfather is now in company with your national apostle
 St. Patrick, and the holy Abbott of Hyona *Adamnan*, and your
 peculiarly adopted patron, the great *Columbanus*, and that from
 their blessed mansion they beheld you, Rev. and most learned
 Doctor, in the act of casting into *Lethe and Cocytus*, the whole
 impression of the *Historical Anecdotes rescued from the libels of such*
writers as Cox and Borlace, and as much as was printed (*i. e.* the
 whole impression of 160 pages) of the instructive and interest-
 ing records of your blessed grandfather’s efforts for about 50
 years with a committee to forward the emancipation of your
 country. Did they, like Raphael, offer the deed to the Lord?

else) forms the pride of the Irish Library at Stowe. You, Rev. and most learned Doctor, tell the public†, “that of the transcripts, and Latin translations of “the five first articles (all of your grandfather’s “collection) part is already in the press, and much “progress has been made in decyphering and trans- “lating several of the documents, that are classed “under the sixth,” Now it appears upon the face of three documents, all from your own pen, viz. the suppressed volume, your letters to me, and the publication in Dodsley, that the whole *quid & pro quo* passed before your reverence and your munificent patron. Not even a third person is introduced to draw up or witness the secret treaty. Poor Mr. Dodsley is, at the distance of five or six years, clumsily introduced, and made to commit to the press some unnatural and overstretched strains of flattery to the two grand plenipotentiaries, who settled the private articles, as if he had been, through the condescension of those two autocrats, latterly admitted to a general and confused knowledge of the grounds, not of the particulars, of the mysterious transaction. But,

Ne qua forent pedibus vestigia rectis,

Your reverence is cautious not to introduce a fourth person on the stage,

Nec quarta loqui persona laboret.

You have however furnished me with irrefragable proofs

† A. D. 940.

proofs of an actual sale, viz. the valuable O'Connor collection, *by far the best in Europe*, given by you to the Marquis of Buckingham, the high price he paid for it, it has cost him more expence than any other person ever incurred. — You, the only person receiving the liberal munificence; for you remained not invigorated or uncheered. Away with the hackneyed farce of covering a sale with the mockery of a voluntary donation, and gratuitous reward. It is the insulting, corrupt jargon of borough-monging. The poet used the word *Auro* for any valuable receipt by the traitor; money or money's worth: or even valuable medium of barter. What else could be *expence incurred* by Lord Buckingham? What else could invigorate or *cheer you*, his venal creature? In applying the word *patriam*, I did not avail myself of the poetical licence of *pars pro toto*; but in prosaic truth and justice I intended to express every part, attribute, and interest of your country, that you could make profit of. The words, I admit, are monitory, and awful, as were those on the wall of Babylon: but the inspiration of a Daniel is not requisite to interpret them.

After the evidence, which you, Rev. and most learned Doctor, had kindly furnished me against yourself, before you commenced your theological career under the title of *Columbanus*, no reader of the slightest inclination to candor will, I am confident, be surprised at, or question the propriety of the following passage

Further proofs of Doctor O'Connor's being the Author of Dodsley's Review.

passage of my Dissertation,* which I would not quote, were the work referred to in circulation. “ We are
 “ disposed to allow Dr. O’Conor the most generous
 “ credit for the fidelity of his proposed translation ;
 “ but we are at a loss to reconcile with his reasoning
 “ his affected eulogy of *Giraldus Cambrensis*, and
 “ other British writers, *who have turned the attention*
 “ *of the learned to the Ancient Annals of Ireland*, and
 “ his profession, that *he does not undertake in any in-*
 “ *stance to justify or defend † any national prejudice,*
 “ *nor would it become him to attempt to amuse, where*
 “ *he could not convince. The subject he has undertaken*
 “ *is so severe, that the reader is relieved from any ap-*
 “ *prehension of being seduced by ingenuity and conjec-*
 “ *ture, or plausibility of declamation.—(p. 6, in the*
 “ *reprint, or Second Edition of the Review of the pro-*
 “ *jected work in 1805).* The wish of Mr. Burke
 “ was, and of those, who sympathize with him is, that
 “ the Ancient Annals should be published, *as they*
 “ *stand, with a translation in English or Latin.* We
 “ see not what conjecture and declamation have to
 “ do with fidelity of translation. That is what is
 “ promised, that is all, that is expected. Whatever
 “ may be the prejudices of his countrymen, if Dr.
 “ O’Connor

* p. 137.

† This whole passage strongly tends to identify the writer of the two letters to me in 1802, with the writer or dictator of Mr. Dodsley’s critique of a work in 1803, that was then said to be at press, but of which no part has yet appeared in 1812.

“ O’Conor despair of his ability of convincing, they
 “ will dispense with his efforts to amuse.”

For the fuller elucidation of some points of modern Irish History, and the more distinct developement of the spirit, by which your country has been hitherto governed, I have found it requisite to follow as closely as evidence would bear me out, the great collection of materials for verifying her history, and to paint faithfully the conduct of you, Reverend and most learned Doctor, in the use and custody of the golden fruit from your first initiation into the confidential charge.

Sacerdos

Hesperidum templi custos

Th’ Hesperian temple was his trusted care.

Dryden’s Virg. iv. Æn.

Until you assumed the name, arrogated the virtues, and contaminated the shrine of Columbanus,* the public was generally ignorant of your atchievements,
 from

* The reader will take the following faraginous batch of learning, and ostentation, and patriotism, from Columbanus’s 4th Let. p. 12, 13, & 14. “ No,—with the blessing of God, “ the shade of the great Columbanus shall not have appeared “ to us in vain. We shall yet have a *National Church*; our “ ancient renown shall not yet be annihilated. There are Saints “ in Heaven, who watch for us ;and though the harps of Ireland “ were all unstrung on the night of Columba’s death, and “ though all Ireland mourned the loss of Columbanus in a fo- “ reign land, where he had the courage to oppose the uncano- “ nical proceedings of Popes and Synods, until his cause was “ fairly heard and fairly decided by the voice of the universal

from the immersion of your labours *in search of truth* in the *Puddle*, at Dublin, to the publication of *Columbanus ad Hybernos* on St. Patrick's Day, in London, 1810; they could only judge of you by your assurances in Dodsley, that the knowledge and attainments of the great Mr. O'Connor, of Balanagare, were more

“ church, yet those great fathers of the western world shall
 “ live in their examples; new energies shall emanate from their
 “ tombs, and England—yes—even thou, O England, shall
 “ lend a helping hand to thy sister country, though differing
 “ from thee in religion, and thou, who in Catholic times, hast
 “ so nobly resisted the encroachments of pretended *spiritual*
 “ *dominion*, shall not now be the *Brutus*, who would assassinate
 “ the liberties of those companions in arts and arms, who are
 “ making with thee the last stand for the rational liberties of
 “ the globe! Considering the Catholic religion in its essen-
 “ tials, and restraining its abuse, thou wilt rejoice in *arrange-*
 “ *ments and facilities* produced by accident, unlooked for and
 “ hitherto uncultivated, which that religion supplies, for ame-
 “ liorating the condition of five millions of people: thou wilt
 “ find amongst that people a strong *sense* of *pure* uncontami-
 “ nated religion, deriving aid from the senses, and it will be
 “ thy business not to unhinge their faith by metaphysical ab-
 “ stractions, but to strengthen and support it by the wholesome
 “ institutions of law.” This luminous and pathetic apostrophe, is enriched with poetic imagery, scholium and notes, to prove the value of the (once) O'Connor collection, and the lore of the Bibliothecarian to its present possessor. In order to inspire his countrymen with confidence in the resuscitation of a *national church*, he classically dreams himself into a demigod, mingling tears with the ghost of Hector, *ultra flens ipse videbar*—(I wept to see the visionary man. Dryd. Virg. 2d Æn.) He

more than amply supplied in his Reverend and most learned Grandson, D. D. and your still unperformed promise of giving them a faithful translation into Latin, of the old Irish Annals down to the 12th century. Now, that you have condescended to publish some of your opinions, to dole out some of your *re-*

L

condite

alludes not to the irretrievable doom of his country, which that ghost came to announce.

Venit summa dies, & ineluctabile tempus
Dardaniæ, fuimus Troes, fuit Ilium, & ingens
Gloria Teucrorum, Ferus omnia Jupiter Argos
Transtulit.

Troy is no more : and Ilium was a town !
The fatal day, th' appointed hour is come,
When wrathful Jove's irrevocable doom
Transfers the Trojan state to Grecian hands.

Dryd. Virg. 2 Æn.

No matter how the quotation fits. I will not disturb the slumbers, lest I should curtail the pleasures even of a classical dream of self-importance.

Si Pergama dextra

Defendi possent etiam hac defensa fuissent.

If by a mortal hand my father's throne
Could be defended, 'twas by mine alone.

Dryd. Ib.

Then the antiquary informs us, that *Tigernach*, A. D. 696, preserved one of the most ancient poems, in which the Irish Harp is mentioned, where is mentioned the death of Columba. *Ex Tigernachi Codice sæculi xiii in Bodleiano Rawlinson 488. fol. 8 b. Colum. 2 lin. 43. Ann. 596. & ex Annal. iv Mag. ad Ann. 593.* CODEX STOWEN. He follows up this display of his grandfather's collection, now under a new appellation, by two Irish

condite knowledge, and to impart some spiritual instruction to your countrymen, in virtue and exercise of your divine rights of priesthood, every one, who can read may judge of you. Imagine not, that I undertake to notice, much less to combat all your errors,

verses, of which he has not descended to favor his English reader with any version. He has taken this opportunity of referring (for the first time that I am aware of) to the progress of his own printed labours; but he deigns not to announce, *ubi prostant venales*. Compare, says he, *my epistle prefatory to the Irish Annals*, p. cxii. For the benefit of his English readers, whose country he so sublimely apostrophizes, he minutely describes the spot, the materials, and the hand, that erected the tombs, from which *new British energies are to emanate*. “The tombs of
 “*Columbanus* and *Cumian*, of white marble, erected by *Liutprand* king of the Lombards, are preserved at *Bobio*, and
 “were visited in the middle ages by crowds of pilgrims from
 “*Ireland*.” So far is the reader indebted to the erudite scholar. But his ignorant readers (one of whom I profess myself to be) will thank the most learned Doctor, if in his next edition he will explicitly inform them what are the *arrangements and facilities produced by accident, unlooked for and hitherto uncultivated, which the Catholic religion supplies, for ameliorating the condition of 5 millions of people?* What are the *metaphysical abstractions*, by which Protestant *England can unhinge the faith* of Catholic Irishmen? And lastly, what are the *institutions of law*, which are necessary, or even capable of *supporting and strengthening* divine faith? This the learned Doctor can have no difficulty in doing, because, he has assured us (4 Col. 39) “I have avoided as
 “much as possible pedantic, technical *school words* of undefined
 “meaning, in order that my own meaning might be the more
 “clear.”

rors, falsehoods, and inconsistencies. Others better qualified for the task, either have undertaken, or as far as may be necessary, will I am confident undertake it. I merely, as one of the simple *lay gentz.* as the lawyers once designated all, who were not clerical, or of the learned profession, shall avail myself of the liberty of the press, to notice some few out of numerous inaccuracies, untruths, and repugnancies, contained in your four letters, under the fastidiously assumed title of *Columbanus*. The sum total of my pretensions, views, and wishes in writing this letter, is to prove to the *impartial* reader not only, that your want of accuracy, impartiality and independence will for ever disqualify you from being an *accredited* historian of Ireland, but utterly discredit you, when wantonly, unwarrantably, and maliciously, you impeach the candour and veracity of other writers. My desultory remarks will correspond with your desultory observations. I can trace neither reasoning, argument, nor conclusion in any one of them. But mistake me not. There is much truth in them. They comprize nearer eight than seven hundred octavo pages; and it would be passing strange, if the man, who has the monopoly of the best collection of materials for Irish History in Europe, should not mix up a predominant and efficient portion of their truth in the birdlime, with which he attempts to entangle the more volatile and less steady of his countrymen in falsehood, error and schism. I am far from being

inattentive to the truths you have written; and I shall by preference quote from you, in order to shew the more distinctly, how you have misapplied truth to the most unworthy purposes. I shall often use your own words of truth to contradict your falsehoods, refute your errors, and counteract your malice. Again I disclaim every idea of entering into a polemical contest upon theological matter. The subject cannot be quite new to him, who from conviction sacrifices his wordly interest in the election of a religion, which excludes him from the best rights of a citizen, and renders him discredited by his superiors, hated by his equals, and trampled on by his inferiors. It remains for me to repel your attacks upon me, and to account for and justify what I have said of you, since you have become a professed author, A. D. 1810.

General nature of Columbanus's mission to divide his countrymen.

On the valuable shelves of Stowe your Reverence may not be at a loss to discover historical evidence, which will bear me out in the following reflections upon your mission to evangelize your countrymen, under the assumed name of *Columbanus*. Since the reformation, the Catholic religion (or *Popery* as in the style of the court it is usually termed) has been the unceasing ground or pretext for oppressing and persecuting the population of Ireland. It long has been an insidious (though now hacknied) art of her enemies to select some ambitious agitator and intriguer from amongst the Catholics, in order to sow and feed

feed dissention in their body. The more religion could be worked up with politics, the more powerful the effects of schism, the more important the triumph. One spirit, one motive, one principle, actuated a Strafford, an Ormond, and each of their modern emulators. It is the peculiarity of the Catholic Church (a badge of her unity) to require from each of her children unequivocal submission to every point essential to her faith and church government. The obstinate rejection of one *necessary* article, or the open adoption of one heterodox opinion upon either, directly opens the door to schism. These *boutfeus* consequently use all the arts of fascination, loudly to discant upon some favourite, popular, uncontroverted topic, or point of necessary faith or discipline, with zeal and enthusiasm, that they may, by insensible gradation, lead their followers from truism, to doubt, obscurity, and error. The sublime functions and exalted character of the Priesthood, to which the Irish have, from time immemorial, paid the most respectful deference, have been generally resorted to by those enemies of Catholicity, as the most efficient wedges for splitting and dividing their body. Detection of the treachery, must be followed by detestation of the traitor. Permit me, Rev. and most erudite Doctor, *not for purposes of my own*, but for the sake of your countrymen, *honestly and above board*, to repeat your own assertion, in which I lament there is but too much truth:—*the writer is a schismatic*

schismatic, perhaps an occult heretic, a degenerate O'Connor, and an Englishman in his heart. I cordially also subscribe to your avowal. I have too good an opinion of the shrewdness of the Irish Clergy and Gentry, to imagine they can be long imposed on by hypocrisy."*

Spirit of
Ormond's
days.

Now, Rev. Doctor of recondite knowledge, permit *a dabbler in Irish history* to drag back your attention to the turbulent times, the sanguinary scenes, and the *Dramatis Personæ*, from which you have selected your heroes, as examples of loyalty, candor, liberality, and patriotism, and imbibed your edifying principles of humility, purity, and docility to your mother church. The Ormondian golden age! Of that I could not join in singing *redeunt Saturnia regna*, because I could not from his, or any of his imitator's conduct, trace the extinction of the *Iron Age* in Ireland, nor the succession of Millenarian beatitude over the whole globe.

Quo ferrea primum

Desinet, ac toto surget gens aurea mundo,

Saturnian times

Roll round again : and mighty years begun

From their first orb in radiant circles run.

The base degen'rate iron offspring ends ;

A golden progeny from heav'n descends.

Dryd. Virg. 4th Past.

* 2 Col. p. 37. Columbanus after all his boast of having washed off the paint, cried down the credit of his grandfather, and cast his own well intentioned labours in search of truth into the peddle, is not altogether indifferent to the judgment of

Of *Ormond* and *Ormondians* we differ *toto cælo*. I consider the unfortunate days, which witnessed their unnatural efforts to divorce their countrymen from their religion

Fœcunda culpæ sæcula, nuptias
Primum inquinavere, & genus & domus ;
Hoc fonte derivata clades
In patriam populumque fluxit.

Fruitful of crimes, this age first stained
Their hapless offspring, and profaned
The nuptial bed, from whence the woes
That various and unnumber'd rose
From this polluted fountain head
O'er Rome, and o'er the nation spread.

Francis's Horace, 3 Lib. Ode 6.

Little did I expect in my old age to be sent on a wild goose chase. But in throwing back my thoughts to my juvenile observations, it recurs to my memory, that whenever that species of gagglers attempted to soar into a more sublime element, than that of their dabbling departments below, one forward bird headed the tribe, and led and marshalled the flock through their airy wanderings; which after exposing themselves to the view and dangers of the enemy, generally

his countrymen. (4 Col. 40). "That base insinuations can
" never affect me, except with those, with whom I have no
" personal acquaintance, are matters of such notoriety, where-
" ver I am known, that I would scorn to allude to them, did
" I not feel it an imperious duty to uphold my character with
" my countrymen."

generally ended in their return, diminished by many losses, to their native bog. But you, most learned Doctor, who set such a value upon yourself and upon all you say and do; surely *all your geese must be swans*. I plume myself on the metamorphose.—

Dropping the grey goose' lowly guise
Into a swan's fair form I rise.

Fran. Hor. L. Ode xx.

Album mutor in alitem.

Ceu quondam nivei liquida inter nubila cycni
Cum sese e pastu referunt, & longa canoros
Dant per colla modos: sonat amnis, & Asia longe
Pulsa palus.

Nec quisquam æratas acies ex agmine tanto
Misceri putet, aeriam sub gurgite tanto

Urgeri volucrum, & raucarum ad littora nubem.

Like a long team of snowy swans on high,
Which clap their wings and cleave the liquid sky,
When homeward from th' wat'ry pastures borne
They sing, and Asia's lakes their notes return.

Not one, who heard the music from afar

Would think these troops an army trained to war,
But flocks of fowl, that when the tempests roar,
With their hoarse gabbling seek the silent shore.

Dryd. Virg. 7. Æn.

Columba-
nus's incoj
herent
praises of
his heroes.

Now let me commit to paper the gabbling notes
of the leader of the Conaught flock. He at all events
will not deny their truth. Nor would Ormond, nor
will any of his emulators or followers upon reading
them, lament, like Alexander at the shrine of Achil-
les,

les, that he had not a Homer to record his fame! The best ancient poets discovered, that the most grateful incense to their patrons, was their approximation and assimilation to Gods, demi-gods, and heroes. Your Reverence was too classical, not to tread the same path, and you have successfully pointed out to your countrymen a modern Pollio, Mæcenas, and Augustus. Such awful reverence do you pay to your munificent, cheering, and invigorating patron, that like some devout Jews, who dare not with unhallowed lips pronounce the name of the Deity, therefore express your obligations, obsequiousness, and devotion in the following anonymous effusion of reverential worship.

* “ And thou kind reader, whoever thou art, who
 “ mayest chance to read this genuine account of the
 “ greatest man † my native country ever produced,
 M “ recollect

* 2 Col. 263. 4.

† *And thou kind reader, whoe'er thou art, who mayest chance to read this genuine account of the greatest man, my native country ever produced, &c., be pleased to pause, ere thou conclude it genuine. Lavish not thy credit on men, * who skim the surface; who have a mouthful of every thing, and a belly full of nothing, as Columbanus elegantly expresses himself. (4 Col. 256.) “ We Irish,” says he, “ have our national vices; but we have our national virtues also. Give me Irish honesty, and I will start with it against all the fine virtues of all the fine nations of the globe.” Dr. O’Conor tells his readers. (2 Col. 226.) “ I have read Oromond’s letters and all, that has been written on that subject,*

* 2 Let. of Col. viii.

“recollect, that the writer has no connection with
 “his family, and no motive of interest, which could
 “seduce

“from N. French, the Bishop of Ferns, *unkind deserter*, down
 “to Plowden’s declamatory compilation, entitled an *Historical*
 “*Review*; and I say distinctly, that it is a malicious falsehood
 “propagated by the foreign influenced men of Ireland, by the
 “ultramontane Bishops, and by the *scurrilous and ignorant wri-*
 “*ters of our times.*” Of one of these, he flippantly assumes a
 gross falsehood. (2. Col. 237.) “But to return to the Duke
 “of Ormond, his letters, which are published, and which Mr.
 “Plowden might have read, plainly shew, that he abominated
 “intrigues, &c.” I shall have future occasion of animadvert-
 ing on his hero’s intrigues: But having read over those let-
 ters, I cannot forbear calling your attention, kind reader, to
 the falsehood contained in these few lines of the monopolizer of
 the truth of Irish history, who misrepresents his hero from the
 very cradle. Ormond, in 1642, wrote to Lord Valentia to
 counteract the falsity and malice of those, that for *private ends*
traduced him, and used *art and aspersions to keep him from the go-*
vernment of the country, which (he squeamishly pretended) he
neither affected nor sought for. In that letter, which *I have* read,
 and which the Reverend, the most learned, the veracious, the
 honest Doctor *may read*, (Orm. Let. 101.) are these extraordi-
 nary words. “I am not only by birth, extraction, and alliance,
 “but likewise in my affections, wholly and entirely an *English-*
 “*man*, and as true a lover of the religion and honor of that na-
 “tion, as any that hath been born and educated there, as I
 “was.” This I call intriguing with the Parliamentarians;—
 pity, that in washing off the paint some Irish honesty came off with the Irish
 prejudices. An honest, true, and consistent Irishman would have gladly avail-
 ed himself of this prominent feature, (Carte says he was born at Clerkenwell)
 of his hero, to perfect the comparison he was about to institute between
 him and the mad, WHOSE NAME HE DARES NOT MENTION. They both flourish-
 ed in the most disastrous times of the British monarchy; one when it was

" seduce him from the path of truth. He is bound
 " by gratitude to one man in this world, but that
 " man, however differing from him in religious opi-
 " nions, would scorn to impose upon him a yoke,
 " which the principles of his head and of his heart
 " must for ever reject. He knows not enough of
 " any other man, *between whom and Ormond he could*
 " *institute a comparison*:—a man whose name he does
 " not dare to mention; who, like Ormond, loves the
 " good and honourable men of all persuasions, without
 " being a bigot to any: and who scorning intriguers,
 " and despising calumniators, will capitulate only to
 " the advantage of his country, and to the principles
 M 2 " of

overset by the pruriency of puritanical democracy; the other, when it was
 nearly undersapt by a system of deceit, corruption, and oppression; which
 dates from the backstairs canvass of the Lords in the debates on Mr. Fox's
 India Bill.

Ambo florentes ætatibus, Arcades ambo.

As it is no part of my system to suppress or disguise the facts of the histo-
 ry, which I VENTURE TO DABBLE IN, a duty devolves upon me to apprise my
 reader, who this great anonymous being is, that Columbanus finds exclu-
 sively worthy to be compared with THE GREATEST MAN HIS COUNTRY EVER
 PRODUCED. He is, the most noble George Grenville Nugent Temple, Mar-
 quis of Buckingham, Earl Temple, Lord Lieutenant and Custos Rotulorum
 of the County of Bucks, High Steward of Westminster, and a Teller of the
 Exchequer (Earl Nugent in Ireland) Knight of the Garter, and Doctor of
 Civil Law. And, (as apud Dodsley Inquisit. critica de futuris contingen-
 tib. Vol. XLV. pro. A. D. 1803), the munificent patron to the secluded
 scholar of recondite knowledge. Compare Tigernach ad Ann. 696 & var.
 mms. vetest. & illegib; necnon præcipue var. mms. recent. Sæc. xviii. de
 Secret. Commitiis Papalium: Scrin. ii. ad Scrin. DXI. Codex. Stowen.
 Compare also that very rare tract DE CORONA PAVONICA ab Urb. III. ad
 Hen. II. Rom. Miss. A. D. 1085. with Alithinal. p. 2: and 2. Col. p. 89.

“ of his conviction.” As you have instituted the comparison between these two all worthies, whatever I presume, you predicate of one, I may with truth predicate of the other. To prove the assimilation, (*who like Ormond loves the good and honourable men of all persuasions, without being a bigot to any*) the veridical historian informs us that * “ Walsh was griev-
 “ ed to see in the Duke’s disposition a sternness of
 “ attachment to his own opinions, which was carried
 “ to the unjustifiable length of shutting his eyes and
 “ ears to all arguments, whether good or bad, which
 “ might be urged against them.” Can a *bigot* be more strictly defined? But *Rien nest beau que le vrai.*†—
Quo me Bacche rapis? “ Our Ormonds who wished
 “ to establish a Protestant Ascendancy, our Parsons
 “ and Borlases, who wished to establish the Purita-
 “ nical; our Scarampis, Rinucinis, Allens, and
 “ other foreign emissaries, who wished to establish
 “ the ascendancy of the Pope, are all equally indiffe-
 “ rent to me. I only wish, that *they* may be all at
 “ rest in another life, *who could never be quiet in this.*”

This

* 2 Col. p. 261. This is the Rev. Peter Walsh, to whom I have in the before-mentioned note of my last story, assimilated *Columbanus*. On that parity I mean to enlarge. I admit that both of them have said many true things, but I lament, that each of them has brought up in the rear a most desperate body of falsehood, error, and schism, which speak not loudly in favor either of their heads or hearts. I hasten to dispatch Ormond.

† 2 Col. 183.

This restless spirit of Ormond, in order to establish a Protestant Ascendancy in Ireland, you repeatedly refer to. I have before remarked that you dash your satire and praise indiscriminately on friend and foe.—

Ormond's
conduct
proved
from Pro-
testant Au-
thors

In the note so often referred to*, I said, “All that
“can be said with propriety at present concerning
“the conduct of the Duke of Ormond to his King
“and Catholic countrymen is, that the author will
“be ready at some future (perhaps no remote) occa-
“sion, to prove from Protestant authors all and
“much more than he has hitherto said of his Grace’s
“public character.” Should I live to bring before
the public a new edition of my enjoined work, I shall
labour intensely to render it in that particular *Emen-
dation & Auctior*. At present be it my theme to
prove, that I had Protestant, or *quasi* Protestant au-
thority for having used the epithets, made the obser-
vations, and drawn the conclusions concerning Or-
mond, which you, Rev. Doctor, have found so
coarse, false, unfounded, and slanderous. Graciously
vouchsafe to allow a simple gaggler to treasure up
some valuable notes of the leading master of the Co-
naught flock.

Vir gregis ipse caper deerraverat.

The father of the flock had wandered from the fold.

Dryd. Virg. 7. Past.

† “One of the most leading features in the tra-
“gical history of our country, from the invasion of
“Henry II. to the accession of the House of Stuart,
“one of those, which is the most intimately connec-
“ted

* 3 Vol. p. 819.

† 2 Col. 27.

“ted with the Catholic question, and one which we
 “ought never to lose sight of, because it is a source
 “of prejudice, which ought to make us somewhat
 “suspicious of our own proceedings, *is hatred to the*
 “*English name and nation*, hatred, deep, gloomy, and
 “inveterate! provoked no doubt by the unprovoked
 “aggression, aggravated by repeated insults, by the
 “plunder, the massacres, and above all, by the bar-
 “barizing of our countrymen, and then by the infa-
 “mous laws for shooting them, because they were
 “barbarized. All these provocations on the part
 “of England are candidly acknowledged. They
 “are candidly acknowledged even with indignation
 “by all the great and good men of the empire.”

Ormond's
 reluctance
 to obey the
 King's
 commands.

* “A cessation for twelve months was accordingly
 “signed at Kilkenny, May 26, 1643, on conditions
 “to be afterwards arranged by Commissioners pro-
 “perly authorized. Those Commissioners met at
 “Castlemartyr on the 23d of June. But Ormond
 “knowing how severely his conduct would be scru-
 “tinized by the Puritans † and hoping to gain some
 “advantage

* 2 Col. 49.

† N. B. The following is Dr. O'Connor's note. “On the
 “day before he set out for Castlemartyr, he delivered a writ-
 “ten proposal to the principal citizens of Dublin, whom he had
 “summoned before the Council Board, that if 10,000l. might
 “be raised, the one-half in money, the other in victuals, and
 “to be brought in within a fortnight, he would, in that case
 “proceed in the war, and break off the treaty for a cessation
 “*already signed!* See Carte's Orm. Vol. 1. p. 437. Leland
 “says, “he was sensible how odious this treaty must prove to

“ advantage over Preston, which might relieve him
 “ from his embarrassment, adjourned the treaty,
 “ marched against Preston, was foiled in his attempt
 “ to surprize him, desponded, and after the receipt of
 “ a fifth letter, from the King, July 2, and a sixth, Ju-
 “ ly 30, in which his Majesty renews his earnest soli-
 “ citations for an immediate treaty, he at length re-
 “ solved to comply. The conditions of cessation
 “ were formally signed at Sigginstown, on the 15th
 “ September, 1643.”

“ The

“ the Parliamentarians. He therefore made the above ignomi-
 “ nious proposal in breach of the public faith. Lel. Vol. III.
 “ p. 205. Compare Tichbourne's Hist. of the Siege of Dro-
 “ gheda, and Carte. ib. and p. 427, 439.”

Here reader you have the authority of Protestant Carte, Pro-
 testant Leland, Protestant Tichbourne, and *quasi* Protestant
 O'Connor, for my having applied some of my *coarse epithets* to
 the great Duke of Ormond : they might have authorized me to
 use others : *treacherous, ungrateful, disloyal, ignominious*. Co-
 lumbanus charges me with the unwarrantable application of the
 term *sanguinary*, (p. 143.) but he omitted to inform his reader,
 that he, who in obedience to his lawful sovereign's sixth pe-
 remptory command, had reluctantly signed a treaty with his
 Majesty's loyal subjects, wished to break it, and spill more
 blood, must be of a *sanguinary disposition*. The learned Doctor
 should, like honest Sir H. Tichbourne, have represented Or-
 mond the petted and intriguing favourite of an abused and op-
 pressed monarch, at the council, where twenty-one of the King's
 enemies were present, each of them contributing 300l. which
 would raise 6,300l. after he had twice urged them to pay him
 10,000l. for disobeying the King, and spilling the blood of his

The King's
wish for
peace
thwarted
by Ormond.

* “ The King's letters to Ormond, in Carte's collection, are completely decisive, not only of his wish, but of his anxious and eager *impatience* for a treaty, and not only for a cessation, but also for a peace. “ If I am driven out of England,” says he, “ at least I will have a place of refuge and safety in Ireland.” †

“ In the postscript of a letter to Ormond, December, 1664, he again says, ‘ I have thought to give you this further order, which I hope will prove needless, to seek to *renew* the cessation for a year, for which you shall promise the Irish, if you can have it no cheaper, to join with them against the Scots and Inchiquin.’ † He had even written a letter,

Catholic subjects. *For even with that he (Ormond) offered to undertake the work, i. e. to proceed with the war, endeavour to take Wexford, and break off the treaty for the cessation. Tichbourne says, in the sincerity of my heart the cessation was as much hindered and delayed by me, as was in my power.* The learned Dr. might perhaps have informed us, why his hero did not undertake the work for the contributory wages of the *ignominious service* as Leland terms it. Carte says, Ormond's first demand of ten thousand pounds could not be raised in Dublin. Tichbourne only says, *this motion of mine finding no place.* Perhaps this regicide Council of 21 were readier to offer, than to pay down their contributions. Protestant and loyal Ormond said of them, in a letter to Sir Harry Vane. (Orm. Let. 53.) *The persons of the men, that govern here, I profess with the faith of an honest man I love and honour.* Here I think is Protestant authority, for adding the epithets, *deceitful, base, and mischievous.*

* 2 Col. 51.

† Ib. 52.

‡ Ib. 53.

“ter, dated July 2, 1643, and addressed not only to
 “Ormond, but also to the Lords Justices, command-
 “ing them to assure the Irish *in his name*, that he
 “was graciously inclined to dissolve the present par-
 “liament, to call a new one, between that and the
 “20th of November following, and to take a course,
 “to put all those, who should be chosen members
 “into such a condition, as that they should not be
 “prejudiced of the liberty of *assisting, settling, and*
 “*voting*, in the said Parliament.” * Having read al-
 “most every thing on the subject of the Irish Catho-
 “lics, from 1640 to 1648, that exists in print or ma-
 “script, in the Cotton, in the Bodleian, and in the
 “Stowe libraries, I feel not the least hesitation in
 “saying, that no people ever were sincere, not even
 “the martyrs, in spilling their blood, if the Irish
 “clergy and gentry were not sincere in their *cessation*,
 “and subsequent peace with the Duke of Ormond. †

† “Ormond was liable to mistakes, as all men are;
 “and I think, that one of his great mistakes consisted
 “in his not placing as much confidence in the su-
 “preme Council, as he well might, before he would

N

“conclude

* 2 Col. 59.

† “Carte, who often betrays his prejudices against the Ca-
 “tholic Confederates, owns, that even the vile conduct of the
 “Puritans did not suppress *the desires*, which the Roman Ca-
 “tholic Nobility and Gentry in arms had of putting an end to
 “the war. Orm. Vol. I. p. 390.”

‡ 2 Col. 228.

“conclude a peace with them. He higgled too long :
 “and by betraying too many suspicions of them,
 “and too much deference to the Puritans, he made
 “them also suspicious in turn ; both were therefore,
 “for some time, unreasonably afraid of each other,
 “until the seasonable opportunity for action had
 “elapsed. Had he cordially thrown all the weight of
 “his influence into the scale against the Puritans, as
 “against the Nuncio, Preston and O’Neil would un-
 “doubtedly have joined him against the Scots, whom
 “they detested. The nobility and gentry would have
 “been with him to a man, and the monarchy would
 “have been saved.”

Columba-
 nus’s affec-
 tion of
 andor a-
 bout Or-
 mond.

* “I envy no man that narrow, contracted, bi-
 “gotted mode of thinking, which, at this distance
 “of time, remote as we are from the dangers and
 “difficulties, in which he was involved, undertakes at
 “a writing desk, to pass judgment of injustice and
 “treachery on Ormond, for the conduct, which in
 “those perplexing circumstances, he was compelled
 “to pursue. I only beg to be heard in favor of one
 “of the most loyal hearted men my country ever
 “produced. I detest falsehood ; and if I advance
 “one word of untruth, I shall most gladly make
 “amends by a public recantation.” Allow me, Re-
 verend Doctor, to dissuade you from recanting in
 detail. Take it in gross ; it will be an operose function:
 “even

even the lecture of this letter may convince you of the lubricity of your own reminiscences. *The pulra-hou beating high at your heart*, your patriotism would sink into annihilation, to rob Ireland of your hero.—

Readdress * “ your countrymen of all parties, men,
 “ whose very errors I respect, because I know your
 “ worth, and I love the ingenuous candour of your
 “ minds.—Whether you hate, or whether you respect
 “ England as I do—whatever may be your principles,
 “ whether of union or of separation—whether you
 “ wish for a new order of things, which will bind
 “ you faster to the state, and bind the state faster to
 “ you---whatever you may think of those great men,
 “ who have so undauntedly espoused your cause in
 “ England---whether you are grateful for the past, or
 “ only cold-blooded and suspicious of the future:
 “ One fact at least will not be denied, that you have
 “ always burned with a high-minded and generous
 “ ardor for the glory and independence of your coun-
 “ try.” Will they thank you? Will they believe you?
 Will they forgive you for bestowing the pre-eminent
 attribute of *most loyal-hearted* on the Englishman, un-
 der whom their ancestors so grievously suffered?
 Your Reverence may rest assured, that there are at
 this hour many more of your countrymen, who give
 larger credit for veracity to the late Dr. French, the
 Catholic Bishop of Ferns, than to the late Catholic
 Parish Priest of Castlereagh; and he has informed us

N 2

in

* 2 Col. 197.

in his *Unkinde Deserter*, that Ormond's brother-in-law, Lord Muskerry, when on his death-bed, declared to * himself

* The Rev. and most learned Doctor Columbanus tells us, (2 Col. 241,)—"Nor will any man, who is at all acquainted with the character of N. French, Catholic Bishop of Ferns, adopt any of the base imputations, which he throws out against Ormond in his *Unkinde Deserter*, since French himself had so often changed sides, that no reliance could be placed on his word." It is to be wished, that Columbanus would inform the dabblers in Irish History, the precise *quantum* of credit a change of sides takes off from an author. However numerous might have been the shiftings of this Prelate, referred to, but not proved by the most learned Doctor, certain it is, that all his writings strongly demonstrate an inflexible tenacity of principle, and an unvarying reprobation of the conduct of Ormond. The *Unkinde Deserter* was published only in 1676, when an interval of about 30 years, chequered with great variety of awful events, had afforded the virtuous Prelate every advantage of allaying irritation, maturing judgment, and availing himself of the intermediate most interesting experience. He then holds a language not very congenial, I will own, with the sympathies and sentiments of the *soi disant Columbanus*, who tells his readers, (4 Col. 84.) "I proceed to an important consideration, which claims the most serious attention of our Nobility and Gentry, and calls for all the wisdom, and all the virtues of the first Statesman, and the most honest and unsophisticated mind, that the British or the civilized world can hold out to the confidence of my country."

"Justum et tenacem propositi virum

"Non civium ardor prava jubentium

"Non vultus instantis tyranni

"Mente quatit solida."

himself “ That the heaviest fear, that possessed his
 “ soul, then going into eternity, was his having confi-
 “ ded

As all my readers may not distinctly know, of whose *most honest and unsophisticated mind*, all these fine things are said, whether of the librarian, or his most noble master ; and some of them may not understand the lines of Flaccus in the dead language, I subjoin an English version ; the more particularly, as I humbly conceive them fully as applicable to Dr. French, as to either of those, for whom they were intended.

The man in conscious virtue bold
 Who dares his secret purpose hold,
 Unshaken hears the crowd's tumultuous cries,
 And the impetuous tyrant's angry brow defies.

Fran. Hor. 3 L. 3 Ode.

(Unkinde Des. p. 23.) “ To be silent and hould my peace,
 “ when an open injury is done to my religion, countrie and pa-
 “ rents, is neither wisdom, pietie, nor virtue to be com-
 “ mended. This is, and hath been (as I perceave) the long
 “ silence the Catholics of Ireland had with the Lord Duke of
 “ Ormonde, giving him both tyme and leisure, to work theyre
 “ ruyne and downfall, without preventing the same (in a just
 “ forme and seasonable tyme) by theyr instant addresses to the
 “ King, Council, or any else.’ And (p. 25) speaking of the
 Bishops and clergy in Ormond's days, he says, “ They were
 “ all silent like men in a fatal lethargy, *Canes muti non valentes*
 “ *latrare*. I did not see, nor hear of any in that numerous
 “ congregation (amongst whom there have been several learned
 “ and wise men) that have written any thing to this purpose in
 “ characterizing (as they should have done) this great man and
 “ his crafty designs to the public ruyne.’ And “ the rejection
 “ of the peace made and agreed in the kingdome's behalfe (by
 “ certain commissioners) with Ormonde, in the year 1646, &c.
 “ This rejection of that peace, Ormonde takes *pro petra scan-*

“ded so much in his *Grace*, who had deceived them
 “all, and ruined his poor country and countrymen.” I
 quote this from a foreign influence man, not to refute
 your charges against me, for *having bespattered Or-*
mond, as you term it, but to shew the prevalence of
 conviction, that he was a real enemy of Ireland. It
 remains for me to produce Protestant evidence, to
 prove the truth of what I have said of Ormond in my
Historical Review, with a malignity and coarseness of
 language as you charge, which no transaction of his
 whole life can possibly justify!

Ormond
 justifies cru-
 elties, and
 criminales
 those, whom
 he believed
 innocent.

On the 23d of December, 1641, Protestant Lord
 Upper Ossory wrote to Protestant Earl of Ormond, †

“I have been threatened as well by the Irish, as the
 “Lord President of Munster, who is so cruel and
 “merciless, that he caused honest men and women to
 “be most execrably executed: and amongst the rest
 “caused a woman great with child to be be ript up,
 “and

“*dali*, and as a dishonor (forsooth) to his person, soe that from
 “that day to this hour he hath been and is still an open enemy
 “to the Bishops and cleargy.” He then refers to a very wise
 and seasonable work in manuscript, which was suppressed by
 the cringing timidity of the exiled Bishops. “Ormonde grew
 “daily more inexorable, and fascinated the Catholic cleargy and
 “Bishops to yield to him.” Certainly that book was little suit-
 ed to the taste, spirit and principles of the *most honest and unso-*
phisticated mind of the civilized world !!!

† Ormond's Let. L.

“and take three babes together out of her womb,
 “and then to thrust every of the babes with weapons
 “through their little bodies. This act of the Lord
 “President’s hath put many in a sort of despera-
 “tion.”

On the 10th of February, 1641-2, the Earl of Ormonde writes, as he says, by leave of the State, to Lord Viscount Gormanstown.* “You say it is
 “taken very ill by the countrie and the Irish armie,
 “that I did make inroads into the countrie, and es-
 “pecially that to the Naas, in which you say, I did
 “burn and destroy much, and hanged some people.
 “You may please to understand, that I am by the
 “King honoured for the present with the command
 “of his armie in this kingdom, &c. His Majesty
 “takes it very ill, that the countrie, contrary to their
 “duty, and contrary to the example of their ances-
 “tors, &c. should not have expressed their gratitude
 “and faithfulness in manfully resisting the treachery
 “plotted and perpetrated against his Crown and in-
 “terests, and in repressing or revenging the unheard
 “of inhumanities committed against his good sub-
 “jects of the Irish nation and Protestant religion, to
 “whose civility and industry, (next under the bles-
 “sing of God) in so gracious a work, we owe the
 “happiness we lately enjoyed; but that, on the con-
 “trary, many of English, and of unspotted extrac-
 “tion,

* Ormond’s Let. 59.

“ tion, have not only countenanced those treasons
 “ and inhumanities, but have been principal actors
 “ in them, &c. I could tell your Lordship, that it
 “ was not by my authority, that any body was hanged
 “ at the Naas : but that would shew like something
 “ of an excuse of my own actions, and the condemn-
 “ ing of some others, (neither of which I intend by
 “ this) for as I take it, those men that suffered there,
 “ received but the reward due to their villainy : so I
 “ will not disavow any thing I shall do in pursuance
 “ of his Majesty’s commands, or by his authority, for
 “ fear of what might befall me or mine.* To con-
 “ clude, I heartily wish, that as one, that has loved
 “ and honoured you personally, that I could, *with*
 “ *loyalty to his Majesty*, and safety to myself, continue
 “ as I have heretofore been,

Your Lordship’s affectionate Friend,

And humble Servant,

ORMONDE & OSSORY.

On

* In order to indulge and flatter the Parliament party, for
 whose inspection that letter was prepared, Ormond, by an af-
 fection of confidence and submission to the state, without
 whose leave he would not write to a Catholic Peer, with whom
 he had before been in habits of intimacy, (this I call intrigue)
 broke out into the following fanatical ascendancy rant, “ The
 “ sense of this ingratitude and cruelty has most justly provok-
 “ ed his Majesty to vindicate his profaned honor with well
 “ warranted armes, and to avert God’s judgments drawn nigh

On the 23d of February, 1641, the following bloody, unjust, and mischievous order was given by the *Protestant* Lords Justices and Council to *Protestant* Ormond. They assumed, that the rebels intended * “to deprive his Majesty of his Royal Crown and Sovereignty here, and root out, murder, and destroy all the *British* and Protestants in the kingdom. In prevention of which, their wicked purposes, our very good Lord the Earl of Ormond and Ossory, Lieutenant General of the Army, is now going abroad with some of his Majesty’s forces to encounter the rebels, and their adherents and relievers, and for depriving them of the benefit and convenience of housing and lodging
O “for

Cruel and
sanguinary
conduct of
Ormond.

“us with the cry of innocent blood, by severely chastising the guilty fomentors, actors, and abettors, of so bold and barbarous crimes. This is a resolution so glorious, and so worthy the great undertaker, that if my hairs were one-half lives and the other children, I should rejoice to loose the last of them in this cause, which *undoubtedly is God’s and the King’s.*” It is to be remarked, that this letter was written nearly four months after the Lords Justices issued their explanatory Proclamation of the 29th of October, 1641, declaring on the remonstrance of the Lords of the Pale, that by the words *Irish Papists*, used in their first Proclamation, they intended only such of the old mere Irish “in the Province of Ulster, as had plotted, contrived, and been actors in that treason, and others, that adhered to them, and none of *the old English of the Pale*, or other parts of the Kingdom.”

* 3 Orm. Let. 61,

“ for their relief. It is resolved, that it is fit, that
 “ his Lordship do endeavour with his Majesty’s said
 “ forces to wound, slay, and destroy, by all the ways
 “ and means he may, all the said rebels and their
 “ adherents, and relievers, and burn, spoile, waste,
 “ consume, destroy and demolish all the places,
 “ towns, and houses, where the said rebels are, or
 “ have been relieved and harboured, and all the
 “ corn and hay, *and kill and destroy all the men there*
 “ *inhabiting capable to bear arms.*” Such was the
 tyrannical mandate of *that State*, without whose leave
 Ormond would not even write to his old friend Ld.
 Gormanstown, and of whom, the Revd. *Protestant*
 Leland truly said * “ Whatever were the professions
 “ of the Chief Governors, the only danger they
 “ really apprehended was, that of a too speedy sup-
 “ pression of the rebellion.† Extensive forfeitures
 “ was

* 3 L. 160.

† There was much congeniality and sympathy between Ormond and *the persons, that governed there*, whom he *professed with the faith of an honest man, he loved and honoured.* Thus, when he informed the Lords Justices, that Messrs. Barnwell, Read, and Barford, had come into him, he sent them to be disposed of according to their Lordship’s pleasure, and *their own demerit*: giving special orders, that the Lords of the Pale should be treated as the meanest rebels, and that all, that offered to come in should be seized by the soldiers as prisoners, and not be permitted access to his Lordship. Soon after the breaking out of the war, the King, at the solicitation of Ormond (from the bed of sickness) made to him two grants of incalculable worth, the value of which would necessarily rise in proportion to the ex-

“ was their object, and that of their friends.” And the Rev. *Protestant* Warner observed, * “ It was the
O 2 “ great

tent and duration of the rebellion. The one was the vesting in him and his heirs all the securities and mortgages upon his estates formerly made, and belonging to such persons as were, or had been in the insurrection; the other, was that of the lands holden under him, and forfeited to him for breach of conditions. This was confirmed by the Act of Settlement (Ormond's consummate deed of Machiavelism). The estates in Kilkenny alone thus granted contained, according to the Rev. *Protestant* Canonizer of Ormond, (2 Carte, Orm. 306. & Seq.) in the whole, “ 215,051 acres and 26,881l 7s. 2d. a-year.” Mr. John Walsh, who, according to Carte, “ was a very good
“ lawyer, and a wise and honest man, who had the chief care
“ of all his estates and affairs,” (p. 308,) had not got time to
“ digest so well, and settle the value of the forfeitures in other
“ counties, but in general he knew, that D'Arcy of Platin's es-
“ tate, and 3 or 4 others, which he mentions, and were all held
“ under his Grace, and consequently forfeited to him, amount-
“ to 8,200l. a year, besides a vast extent of forfeited land in
“ Kerry.” (p. 309). “ The forfeited estates, to which he was
“ entitled, and which, added to these in the Counties of Dub-
“ lin, Meath, Kildare, Catherlow, Waterford, Cork, Kerry,
“ and Galway, to the lands already mentioned in the counties
“ of Kilkenny and Tipperary, contained between three and
“ 400,000 acres.” You, Rev. and most learned Doctor, who well know the value of Irish acres, have told us, (2 Col. 224.) that Dr. French, late Bishop of Ferns “ at Paris, attempted
“ to wait upon King Charles II. who refused to see him; and
“ imputing this refusal to Ormond, he ever after vilified and

* Hist. of the Irish Rebellion, p. 130.

“ great misfortune of that unhappy country, to be
 “ then governed by a man (Sir William Parsons),
 “ that had not one qualification for such a post, at
 “ such a time; and to these defects was added *great*
 “ *obliquity of heart towards both the King and the Irish.*”

A pretty soothing palliative for a *traitor, rebel, and exterminator*. So overzealously did Ormond sympathize with this *obliquity of heart towards the King and the Irish*, that he even outheroed Herod. The narrow boundaries of Bethlehem were too contracted for

“ calumniated him in all his writings.” Now be pleased to compare Carte (*ubi supra*) with French, *Unkinde Deserter*, p. 166. “ It is affirmed, that he got as many gentlemens’ estates, “ upon the pretence of a grant of enjoying all lands, that he “ could prove (by witnesses) to have paid him any chiefry, as “ were worth at least 150,000*l.*” Which of these two writers vilified? Which calumniated your unparagoned hero?—Your Reverence complains (2 Col. 233.)—“ That it has been “ the curse of our country, that whenever an *Irish* (born at “ Clerkenwell) Protestant was eminent, either as a Statesman, “ or a military man, or an author, the Catholics vilified his “ character and obscured his reputation.” Was Lord Essex, a Catholic? who said, (State Let. p. 213. 4.) “ My Lord Duke “ of Ormonde has received above 300,000*l.* in this kingdom, “ besides all his great places and employments: and I am sure “ the losses in his private estate have not been equal to those I “ have suffered (in the preceding civil war), and yet he is so “ happy, as no exception is taken to it.” The reader may also (see Appendix, No. I) Carte’s list or schedule of lands granted to Ormond by the Act of Settlement and Court of Claims.—(2 Orm. p. 134).

for his capacious views of extirpation. The Revd. Protestant Carte * has informed us, that in another order of the state, dated the 3d March, 1641, which after reciting the former order, and that it was thought fit, that the very good Lord the Earl of Ormond and Ossory should march with 3000 foot, and 500 horse towards the Boyne, “to prosecute with
 “fire and sword (*as he shall think fit*) the places,
 “towns, and houses, where the rebels, their adherents, or abettors are, or have been relieved and
 “harboured, or now or lately (*usually* †), resided,
 “yet soe, that the forces do not pass beyond the river of Boyne; but march in such places between
 “the Boyne and the sea, *as his Lordship shall think fit*, and so as his Lordship take care, that no corne,
 “hay, or house be burnt within five miles of Dublin

* 3 Orm. Let. 62.


† To this word *usually*, Carte, the professed Protestant encomiast of Ormond, annexes the following note, which argues some uneasy reflection, conscientious doubt, and intriguing communication with the Council about such an execution of their bloody orders, as should palliate, justify, or conceal *his obliquity of heart towards the King and the Irish*, “This word was
 “not originally in the order, but upon the Earl of Ormond’s
 “desiring an explanation of their meaning, and refusing to let
 “Sir Simon Harcourt go upon this expedition, as chief commander in his stead (which the Lord Justices earnestly desired
 “of him) it was interlined by Sir William Parsons, and yet in
 “the letter of the whole board to the said Earl, dated March
 “13, 1641, it is omitted.”

“ lin. And it is thought fit, that his Lordship shall
 “ not be absent from hence above eight daies, unless
 “ during his absence we shall send him further di-
 “ rection to that purpose.” Six days after Ormond
 had been playing the exterminating angel, he wrote
 to the Lords Justices, on the 9th March, 1641, from
 Dunshoglan, that he and others were of opinion, *
 “ that we, with such strength, as may be spared out
 “ of Drogheda should prosecute the victory, and re-
 “ bels as far as the Newry, &c.; and therefore I do
 “ most humbly and earnestly beseech your Lordships,
 “ that my authority may be to *this end enlarged* : and
 “ that I may receive such further instructions, as to
 “ your great wisdom shall be thought fit ; which
 “ shall, with all possible diligence and faithfulness be
 “ pursued by

“ Your Lordship’s most

“ Humble Servant,

“ ORMOND & OSSORY.”



Can your most learned Reverence still continue to
 be indignant at my having applied the epithet of *sangui-
 nary*, to this forward *dilettante* in Catholic *Irish*
 blood ; this bold, adventurous *Apolluon*, this keen,
 though degraded, suppliant to the fanatical Parlia-
 mentarians for an enlarged range of *Haceldama* ? It
 was not from Dr. French, nor any other *blind foreign*
influence

* 3 Orm. Let. 36.

influence-man, that I was *blindly* led to form such a judgment of your *pre-eminently just, loyal-hearted, and unsophisticated hero*.

On the 10th March, 1641, Sir John Temple, an inveterate Protestant, in a private letter, evidently intended to have been kept secret, but luckily for Ireland, not consigned to the Poddle, nor immured at Stowe, thus writes to Ormond what he would not have communicated but to a man of systematic intrigue.*

Ormond's
spirit of
intrigue.

“ My particular affection to your service makes me
“ very vigilant in any thing, that may concern your
“ Lordship here, and I must tell you in private, that
“ I find your proposition of going to the Newry ab-
“ solutely disliked by all, that sit at this board, &c.
“ Some do sharply resent it, and think your Lord-
“ ship might well have foreborne the making of that
“ overture. Give me leave, as one highly valuing
“ your person, to deal freely with you, and to be-
“ seech your Lordship to be very careful, how you
“ carry yourself in receiving such submissions, as
“ shall be tendered to you, &c. I am here with
“ strong affections to serve you, and think I cannot
“ do it better, than by dealing freely with you.—
“ Make what use of it you please to yourself, and
“ believe it proceeds from one, that is really

“ Your Lordship's

Dublin Castle,
May 10, 1641.

“ Most humble Servant,
“ J. TEMPLE.”†

* 3 Orm. Let. 64.

† This confidant and friend of the intriguing Ormond was

Ormond re-
news his
application
for an en-
larged
commission

Within two days, (so eagerly did he overact his part with the rebellious Puritans) repeated his urgent solicitation to the Lords Justices, backed by the signatures of Sir Henry Tichbourne, and to other officers of his cast,* “ We do (as formerly) beseech your Lordships, for an alteration of your Lordships

Master of the Rolls and a Privy Councillor, against whom, in the ensuing year, Lord Dillon, and four others of the Privy Council, preferred a charge to the King, expressly alledging (3. O. Let. 20.) “ That the said Sir John Temple did in the month of May last, write two traitorous and scandalous letters against his Majesty; besides many other acts of high treason, of which he in common with Sir William Parsons, Sir Robert Meredith, and Sir Aaron Loftus, was directly accused. He was the man, of whom *Protestant* Dr. Nalson said,” (Intr. to 2 Vol. of Hist. Col.) “ that Sir John Temple, in writing his history of this rebellion, was bound by confederacy, to assert the proceedings of these Lords Justices: and I cannot find *him* highly in reputation with the usurpers of the Parliamentary faction, and by them empowered as Commissioner to impose upon the Protestant subjects of Ireland that traitorous, disloyal, and solemn league and covenant, which was a direct oath of confederacy, not only against, but purposely to ruin and destroy the King, the Church, and the loyal party; I cannot observe his book to be printed at London, in 1646, by public allowance, a time when no books were licensed, but such as made court to the prevailing factions of the usurpers, or which might be helpful to support their calumnies against his Majesty, especially as to the Irish Rebellion, *without too just a suspicion of his integrity.*”

* 2 Orm. Let. 65.

“ ship’s instructions in two particulars, viz. both for
“ enlarging our commission to march further north-
“ ward in fresh pursuit of the said rebels, than the
“ Boyne: and also to stay (occasion so requiring) a
“ longer time than was limited us from Dublin.” In
a postscript to his first letter from Dunshoglan, to
the Lords Justices, he said, “ My Lords, I humbly
“ desire, that I may be directed what I shall do, in
“ case the Lords or Gentlemen come in to offer them-
“ selves unto me: and whether I shall burn and de-
“ stroy the houses and goods of the Lords? I am
“ bold to desire this particular direction concerning
“ them in regard of their quality; and that there
“ came no direction concerning them forth of Eng-
“ land, though desired by your Lordships.” When
Ormond wrote to thank Lenthall the Speaker of the
English House of Commons for their voting him a
jewel of the value of 500*l.* he artfully alluded to the
loyalty of his ancestors, *at all times the best, and now*
the only inheritance left me. This coqueting was kept up
between Ormond and the Parliament. For Lenthall,
when he was commanded to express their satisfaction
in his good services performed by him against those
wicked and bloody rebels, adds, * “ These lines will
“ further assure your Lordship, that no more reports
“ or false scandals, which any malicious tongue may
“ have raised concerning you, can make the least im-
pression

* Orm. 92.

“pression in them, who can easily see through such
 “empty clouds, and fasten a clear judgment upon
 “true and honourable desert.” To which the in-
 triguing Ormond replied, * “I must also acknow-
 “ledge the nobleness and justice of that honourable
 “House unto me, in giving a right judgment of
 “those false scandals, which malicious persons may
 “have endeavoured to cast upon me, who will never
 “be wanting to the utmost of my power, cheerfully
 “to express my ardent zeal with the hazard of my
 “life and fortunes, and whatsoever may be dear unto
 “me in the world, for the suppressing of this wicked
 “and unnatural rebellion, and for the advancing of
 “the Protestant religion.” In the like ardor of re-
 commending his anti-catholic zeal, when Ormond had
 forwarded to England the Petitions of several Gentle-
 men of the Pale, who were imprisoned without reason
 in Dublin, he admitted that they had surrendered
 to him upon honor, and that he knew nothing against
 them; but added, with stimulative malice, as if fear-
 ful, that he should be thought even *just* to Catholics,
 he wrote to Lenthall† “To enter into their hearts
 “and search what is there, is only peculiar to God,
 “&c. The *wisdom* of that *Great Council* doth best
 “know to advise his Majesty, when and where, and
 “to whom, for the most advantage of the present
 “service to distribute mercy, and to their great wis-
 “dom do I submit these petitions.”

On

* Ib. 104.

† Ubi, Supra.

On the 5th of August, 1643, Ormond in a letter to Lord Clanrickarde confesses, that he was well aware of the anti-basilican spirit and designs of that Parliamentarian State, with which he had so basely coquetted.* “Mr. Brent landed lately here, and hath brought letters, which have something changed the face of this Government from what it was, when the Parliament Pamphlets were received as oracles, their commands obeyed as laws, and extirpation preached for gospel.” During that time was it, that the *just, loyal-hearted, and unsophisticated* hero was boasting his sympathies, lavishing his confidence, and prostrating his obsequiousness to them. In proof of the unsophisticated loyalty of Ormond, he writes in November, 1643, confidentially to rebellious Inchiquin, what he was little warranted in saying.† “I suppose it will be needless for me to let you know, the King would not buy the help, which those forces can give him in England *at the price of this kingdom*. This I take to be sufficient for me to say; positive advice at this distance being as dangerous to the giver, as it would be troublesome to the receiver.”

Ormond's
insincerity
confessed
by himself.

The evidence of the motives for acts of notoriety, are only to be gathered from the confidential communications of the actors, before or about the time of their taking place; and more especially from such, as are not made with a view to publication. Thus Or-

His Machia-
velianism
boasted of.

P 2

mond

* Ubi. Supra. 170.

† Ib. 204.

mond just after his elevation to the Marquisate and the Government of Ireland, tells Lord Digby, that *to his honour and nobleness he dares to commit his apprehensions with secure freedom.** Then after recommending certain measures to be taken, he boasts of his Machiavelian power of thereby dividing the Catholic body. “By this means, I am persuaded, if there
 “should be any disturbance endeavoured by the
 “worst affected, it may be possible so to *divide* them,
 “and engage some of them against others, that much
 “safety will be thereby derived to his Majesty’s in-
 “terests and to his Protestant subjects here.” He admits, that he had employed all his skill to stop the going over of the Scot’s army, which he hoped would prevail, &c. “If these considerations
 “fail, I shall look out the *fittest temptations* I can think
 “of.” To complete the Machiavelian system of unsophisticated loyalty and sincerity to the Irish, he concludes. “But if I be not unnecessarily repre-
 “sented to them, *as an hinderer of their designs*, I
 “shall the better be able to serve the King in what
 “he expects.” † In a letter to Prince Rupert, the Marquis accounts for his inability to procure arms and ammunition from the Catholics; “nor are they,” says he, “much to be blamed, the Scots being yet
 “here in great numbers: and fresh reports coming
 “daily, that they will not only begin the war afresh
 “with them, but endeavour to impose the taking of
 “their

* 3 Orm. Let. 225.

† 1b. 280.

“their covenant upon us by force of arms.” A further confidential communication to Lord Digby, more manifestly displays the Machiavelian principles of the *unsophisticated and loyal-hearted* Governor.*—
 “The plain truth is, the hatred they (i. e. the Scots, whom Ormond *had done all he could to prevent going over,*) “have contracted (upon intolerable provocation) against the Irish, will not suffer the best affected of them to consider, how far his Majesty is concerned in the present quiet of the kingdom. “under the warrantable profession of this hatred “those here, that affect not the King’s cause, do so “cunningly prepare this army and people to resist “all accommodation with the Irish, that they cannot be punished, but it will appear to ordinary “understandings, to be in justification of the Irish, “and in countenance of their religion.”

Permit me now, Rev. Sir, and most learned Doctor to offer some palliative to your indignation, by justifying, on *Protestant* authority, the *sort of language scarcely to be tolerated amongst civilized nations*; and to prove to *my* readers at least, that it is not *the vulgar and bigotted pamphleteering jargon of a Castabala*, but drawn from the authorities of a Protestant King, his Majesty’s Protestant Viceroy, and his Excellency’s Protestant Panegyrist.† “The impossibility of “preserving my Protestant subjects in Ireland by “continuation of the war, having moved me to give “those

His misconduct to the Catholics proved from the highest Protestant authority.

* 3 Orm. Let. p. 280.

† Ib. 387

“ those powers and directions, which I have formerly
 “ done, for the concluding of a peace there; and the
 “ same growing daily much more evident, that alone
 “ is reason enough for me to enlarge your powers,
 “ and to make my commands in that point more
 “ positive. But besides these considerations, it being
 “ now manifest, that the English rebels, have as far as
 “ in them lies, given the command of Ireland to the
 “ Scots, that their aim is a total subversion of reli-
 “ gion and regal power; and that nothing less will
 “ content them, or purchase peace here, I think
 “ myself bound in conscience not to let slip the
 “ means of settling that kingdom, if it may be law-
 “ ful, under my obedience, nor lose that assistance,
 “ which I may hope for from my Irish subjects, for
 “ such scruples, as in a less pressing condition might
 “ reasonably be stuck at by me for their satisfaction.
 “ I do therefore command you to conclude a peace
 “ with the Irish, whatever it cost.” In order to prove
 Ormond’s *inflexible reluctance to obey any of the King’s*
commands favourable to the Catholics, I certainly did
 quote Ormond’s letter to Lord Digby, in which he
 says, “ If I take the charge of this army upon me,
 “ or denounce immediately an offensive war against
 “ the Scots, not *ten Protestants will follow me*, but
 “ rise as one man, and adhere to the Scots.” That
 whole letter is a laboured, hypocritical attempt by
 this *abominator of intrigue*, to gloss over his reluctance
 to obey the King’s *commands favourable to the Catholics*,
 at

at the very time he was carrying on a secret treaty with the Scots in Ulster, to join him against the confederates.

This loyal-hearted unsophisticated Viceroy writes to his friend, Humphry Galbraith, an Officer in Munroe's army, in answer to a letter from him about a month before; and referring to this treaty, he says * *perhaps one return more may make us understand one*

Ormond
corresponds
with Gal-
braith, and
favours the
Scotch Co-
venanters.

another better. He tells this Scotch Covenanter: "I believe, since you writ your letter, you have heard of a plot (it was for Monroe to be put into possession of Drogheda, Dublin, &c.) that was here discovered, set on foot by malicious, and to have been acted by a misled people, as in charity I am to believe. By letters from thence, I find it is misunderstood and believed, that all the Scots serving here, were in it, or so far mistrusted, as that they were under a great cloud of suspicion. You have learned how difficult it is, to stop the mouths of common people, for whose discourses in these licentious times, it were hard justice to make those, who govern them answer. Allowing this, I confidently affirm to you, that though some Scots, and of those, such as had best reason, have been too far guilty; yet the nation has lost no jot of esteem or trust, in the more considerate, who lost by it, and it will be found, that no rigour beyond neces-
sity

“sity, in order to our preservation, hath been or
“will be used.”

Ormond
admits the
loyalty of
the Catho-
lics when
too late.

Not very long after *this abominator of intrigue* solicited the King to promote Colonel Chichester to the Earldom of Donegal, because he was no longer able to serve his Majesty in Ulster, *on account of an almost general defection of the Northern army.** At this very period Ormond was assured by Lord Clanrickarde, in whom he always affected to place plenary confidence, that if the impediments to the peace were once removed, the Catholic confederates would † give his “Lordship satisfaction, and make appear their real
“earnest desire to be employed in his Majesty’s ser-
“vice; and that the difficulty would be rather to
“keep back the multitude of forward spirits, that
“would press into that expedition.” The whole of this was confirmed by the *loyal hearted, unsophisticated abominator of intrigue*, when his assuming the garb of sincerity, even to his colleague Digby, was too late, viz. on the 22d of January, 1648 ‡ “The peace
“is at length concluded, and that (I think) clearly
“within the powers I had. I must say for this peo-
“ple, that I observed in them great readiness to
“comply with what I was able to give them, and a
“very great sense of the King’s sad condition. I am
“most confident, if we can but receive moderate
“countenance and assistance from abroad, the king-
“dom

* 3 Orm. Let. 142.

† Ib. 413.

‡ Ib. 600.

dom will very speedily be in absolute subjection
 to the King's authority, and ready powerfully to
 assist any design, that may be for his restoration
 in both, or either of the others." In a letter of the
 same date to the Prince of Wales, Ormond attributes
 the overcoming of many difficulties, that occurred in
 the transaction, "first, to the remarkable constancy
 of the Lord President of Munster on the one side;
 and then to the very eminent loyalty of the assembly
 on the other."

Lord Digby, in July, 1646, arrived from Paris in Dublin, * "with full assurances," as he says, "newly
 received there, from the King my Master, that he
 had redoubled his positive orders unto the Mar-
 quis of Ormond, both immediately before his com-
 ing from Oxford, and since his being at Newcastle,
 for the immediate perfecting of the peace in Ire-
 land according to the articles agreed on; and finding
 however on his arrival, that a stop had been put to
 it by occasion of a letter, dated from Newcastle,
 11th June, supersigned *Charles Rex*, and attested
 Lanerick, and knowing by his Majesty's free
 expression of his will and pleasure, and of his re-
 solutions and designs in the whole state of his af-
 fairs, how contrary to his free will such letter was,"
 he adds, "I do according to my duty as Secreta-
 ry of State, upon certain knowledge of his Majes-
 ty's

Digby's
 evidence
 that the
 King's let-
 ter from
 Newcastle
 was either
 forced or
 forged.

Q

* 3 Orm. Let. 491.

“ ty’s resolution, and as I will answer it with my life,
 “ declare unto his Excellency the Lord Lieutenant
 “ and Council of his Majesty’s kingdom of Ireland,
 “ that the said letter of the 11th of June, is either a
 “ surreptitious letter, or a forced one from his Majes-
 “ ty, procured upon some false information of the
 “ state of his affairs, and most contrary to what I
 “ know to be his free resolution and unconstrained
 “ will and pleasure. And I do further declare with
 “ the same solemnity and engagement of my life, that
 “ if the peace of Ireland shall not be presently con-
 “ cluded, the hinderers of it, are the occasion of sub-
 “ verting and destroying the main foundation re-
 “ solved, and laid by his Majesty for the recovery of
 “ his own, his crown and posterity’s rights.”

Ormond
 still favours
 the Parlia-
 mentarians
 and was in
 their pow-
 er,

Within very few months from this declaration of
 Digby, the just, loyal-hearted, and unsophisticated
 Ormond,* assured his Sovereign, “ how much bet-
 “ ter it is in all probability for religion, your Crown,
 “ and faithful servants here, that these places be given
 “ to the Parliament, rather than to the Irish rebels.”
 I am thoroughly convinced, most learned Doctor,
 that had the great, unparagoned Ormond foreseen
 that his atchievements would have been dignified by
 your exalted eulogies, he never would have so can-
 didly unbosomed the genuine feelings of the moment
 of humiliation as he did, to his friend and colleague
 Lord Digby.* “ I was yesterday summoned to leave
 “ the sword and castle within four days, &c. and so
 “ much

* 2 Orm. Let. 559.

“much I am in their power, that there was no disputing of the matter. So that I was fain to endeavour to accommodate the business by consenting to leave the securing the castle to them, and defer the ceremonial part of leaving the sword till the set time, which I hope will content them. Here your Lordship sees my sense and condition.”

Ormond boasted to the King of his Machiavelian powers of division and command.* “I may not conceal from your Majestie, that even upon the answer already given, and the use to be made of one of the bills now transmitted, I conceive I am able to ruin their supremacy by dividing their party; but in that case, neither can your Majestie expect assistance from hence, nor I undertake, but that in the end, we here shall be all rooted out by the Scots, and such as adhere to them.” Carte however says of this just and unsophisticated abominator of intrigue, “It will not lessen the world’s opinion of the Marquis of Ormond’s wisdom and dexterity, that under the disadvantage of having his measures known, and notwithstanding the Council was thus forewarned, he yet found means to divide them.”

Ormond’s
Machiavelianism.

To you, Rev. Doctor, I make no apology, whatever may be due to my other readers, for dwelling so long upon the unrivalled excellencies of the greatest man your country (Clerkenwell) ever produced. I felt it a duty to point out the pages and authorities, I, for one of the gagging wild geese followed. I

Ormond’s
treachery
exclusion
of the Catholics from
place.

shall

Q 2

* 3 Orm. Let. 503.

shall end my gabble on this subject by Carte's minute display of *the just and unsophisticated mind* of that man, * *who loved the good and honourable men of all persuasions, without being a bigot to any, and who scorning intrigues and despising calumniators, would capitulate only to the advantage of his country, and to the principles of his convictions.* The King (at Ormond's request) by warrant under his signet, dated May 11, 1642, empowered him (during the absence of the Lord Lieutenant, and as long as the rebellion lasted) to appoint all subordinate officers both in the old standing army and the new forces.† “The Earl was at that time well enough with the Lord Lieutenant, (Earl of Leicester) and was much courted by the Parliament, in order to engage him in their party, (for which purpose their agents represented it as the way to greater honours and dignities than any of his family ever enjoyed), but the King entirely satisfied of his Lordship's fidelity and affections, thought fit to give him this mark of his confidence; though either for fear of giving discontent to the Earl of Leicester, or jealousy to the Parliament, or for some other reason, it was thought proper to keep this commission secret for a time.” His Majesty afterwards, by letters patent, dated 22d of May, 1645, under the great seal of Ireland, authorized the Marquis of Ormond after the conclusion of the peace, to sign such commissions as he should think fit ‡ for the advancing of the natives of that our kingdom, “with-

* 2 Col. 264. † 1. Carte Orm. 334. ‡ 3 Orm. Let. 408.

“ (without exception of any) to places of command,
 “ honour, profit, and trust in our armies there, accord-
 “ ing to their respective merits and abilities, and that
 “ therein no difference be made *by you* between them
 “ and our good subjects, according to the answer
 “ made by you in our behalf to the eighth proposition,
 “ in which respective commissions you are to cause
 “ such grants and *non obstantes* to be inserted, as may
 “ remove all impediments and hindrance whatsoever,
 “ which do or may disable any of our subjects to ex-
 “ ercise the said places.” Now reader mark the
 workings of the most *just and unsophisticated mind* un-
 der all this discretion, duty and power.

* “ Next to the insecurity of their estates, there
 “ was no grievance, which before the troubles so much
 “ affected the Roman Catholics of Ireland as their
 “ utter incapacity for preferment, and the exclusion
 “ of them from all places of honour and trust.
 “ The Marquis of Ormonde was satisfied, that it
 “ was this grievance, which disposed them most
 “ effectually to take up arms, and was perswaded,
 “ that unless it was in some measure removed, it
 “ would be the point, on which they would break
 “ in a treaty of peace: though in such case they
 “ would (as they had done in the other) impute
 “ the breach to want of satisfaction in matter of
 “ religion, which was the only motive, that weighed
 “ with the people. Men of spirit, such especially
 “ as by their dignity, families and estates, seem
 “ born

Grievance
 of Catholic
 exclusion
 from place.

“ born for power, can never bear to be in consider-
 “ able in their own country, and to live exposed
 “ continually to the insults and contempt of their
 “ equals and inferiors. Nothing therefore was more
 “ proper, than to give the principal leaders of the
 “ confederate Irish some hopes in this respect: but
 “ it could not be done with success, if their persons
 “ were harshly received at court, or such discour-
 “ tenance shewn them as would make them, justly
 “ apprehend, they should not be the better for any
 “ capacity, that was granted them. There were at
 “ this time many considerable posts either vacant,
 “ or likely to be so, by the impeachment of the four
 “ counsellors, and the open malignancy of disloyalty
 “ and disobedience of others; which were already
 “ devoured by persons about the court of England,
 “ who sued for and expected them. The disposal
 “ thereof in such a manner could not fail of reviving
 “ the heavy complaint, which ever had been, and
 “ it is to be feared (such is their unhappy fate) ever
 “ will be made by the natives of Ireland, that all
 “ their preferments are given to strangers, who hav-
 “ ing no natural affection for the country, nor any
 “ concern therein, but for the raising their private
 “ fortunes, are little solicitous for its general wel-
 “ fare. The keeping of these places vacant was a
 “ silent and inoffensive way of flattering the hopes
 “ of such, as imagined themselves qualified to fill
 “ them, and therefore the Lord Lieutenant wished,
 “ they might be so kept, or at least, if it were need-

ful, to dispose of them out of hand, that they
 might be filled with such Irish Protestants, as had
 not been for the extirpation of the Popish natives;
 (therefore such there were); “which was the like-
 liest method to give satisfaction to both sides, and
 could not be justly excepted against by either.”

Thus, Rev. and most learned Doctor have I, ac-
 cording to my humble means, and in part perfor-
 mance of the task you imposed upon me, endeavour-
 ed to throw down my mite at the shrine of your hero
 of Clerkenwell; yet he numbers among the brave
 heroes of your country, whom you lament as having
 perished at home and abroad, without even a pros-
 pect of *posthumous renown*.* *Omnes illachrymabiles*
carent quia vate særo. Cast off your squeamishness:
 try your hand, once more, at this extraordinary cha-
 racter,

Columbanus called
 upon for a
 full and
 truer por-
 trait of Or-
 mond.

* This loose and imperfect quotation from Horace untrans-
 lated, may not satisfy some of my country readers: for their
 benefit, therefore, I subjoin the whole passage in my vernacu-
 lar tongue. The lines will sublimiate their ideas of *Ormond the*
Great:

Before great Agamemnon reign'd
 Reign'd Kings as great as he and brave,
 Whose huge ambition's now contain'd
 In the small compass of a grave:
 In endless night they sleep, unwept, unknown,
 No bard had they to make all time their own.
 In earth, if it forgotten lies,
 What is the valour of the brave?
 What difference, when the coward dies
 And sinks in silence to the grave.

Fran. Hor. 4 E. Ode 9.

racter, though you profess *not to derive satisfaction from those exhibitions of eloquence, however classical, which are styled characters.* You cannot leave to the chance of oblivion a line of that *manly countenance, which expressed greatness of soul, and was full of sweetness and modesty, and had most the air and dignity of his quality of any man about the Court.* Let posterity indulge in contemplating *that manliness and dignity of appearance,* which once would have been *so enthusiastically followed.* Couple that with the rich harvest of his Noble achievements, which must inspire the bard, that is about to sing his praise, *Ormonii res gestæ uberem laudum segetem cuivis eas decantaturo subministrabunt** Not to treat posterity with a rich glowing portrait from all the advantages you, Rev. Doctor, exclusively possess, would be laid to the account of inertness.

(Paulum sepultæ distat inertię

Celata virtus.

Virtue through indolence suppress'd

Sure as the tomb puts fame to rest.)

in the *erudite Bibliothecarian not uninigorated or uncheered by the warm beams of munificent patronage,* to the only man, *between whom and Ormond could be instituted a comparison.* Although most learned Doctor, you have referred me to Horace's Ode to Lollius, who afterwards became notoriously covetous and rapacious, I will not apply to you that stoical abstemiousness from all-seducing pelf, which the Poet so beautifully, through (perhaps) ignorance of his real character

* 2 Col. 241.

† 2 Col. 224.

racter, perhaps through gross flattery, perhaps thro' sarcasm, applied to Lollius.

Vindex avaræ fraudis, & abstinens

Ducentis ad se cuncta pæcuniæ.

Avenging miser's frauds in hoarding pelf

He spurns that gen'ral tractor to itself.

The following adage is not beneath your Reverence's consideration and adoption. *Ut vera laus ornat, ita falsa castigat.* The keenest satire is inapplicable praise. My abuse of Ormond brought the weight of your heavy ordnance upon me. Your abuse of the Governors and discipline of the Church, and some tenets of the religion of your countrymen, forms the most serious charge I have to urge against your Reverence. But it is a charge of most serious import, *essential* to the religious freedom of five millions of your fellow subjects, and bringing to the severest test your Reverence's knowledge and belief, sincerity, fidelity, and correctness, as an historian and theologian. I shall endeavour to simplify, consolidate, and counteract your efforts to divide and mislead your countrymen, through the insidious, lubricous, and dangerous bye-ways, into which your five Letters or Addresses to them diverge. In the indefinite variety of matter * they embrace, it is impossible to

R attempt

* If Columbanus should hereafter attempt to give us a new Edition, or compression of the substance of his five numbers; the following title of a German work is submitted to his adoption. *De omni & quolibet possibili ente & quibusdam aliis.* Of each and singular possible being and some others to boot.

attempt any thing like order, in following or refuting them. In spite of your boast, that * Dr. Pointer's inability "to point out any proposition in your works, " that is *heretical* or *schismatical*, leaves you in position of your orthodoxy, and exposes the rashness " of him, who talked *so wisely* of retractation and ex- " communication," I do not despair of fixing you with many assertions and meanings, that it is my duty, as an historian of Ireland, to caution your countrymen against, many doctrines, which they ought to reprobate, many scandalous calumnies, mischievous falsehoods, and dangerous errors, which your Reverence is called upon to recant, correct, and retract, according to your promise.† " I detest falsehood; and if I advance one word of untruth, I " shall most gladly make amends by a public recantation."

Columbanus's wish
for a Bishopric.

I have said in the note so often referred to in the third volume of my post-union history; " It is self-evident, that the full and ultimate views of Doctor O'Connor's violent publications upon the *Veto*, do not stand explicitly upon the face of them. *Volo Episcopari* nowhere occurs in words." You, Rev. and most learned Doctor, who tell me, that *in every assertion I ought to be guided by evidence*, will not think it strange, that I collect your *Animus Episcopandi* from the following circular printed letter to the Clergy of your

* 4 Col. 7.

† 2 Col. 217.

your diocese, signed by your own brother, who would not have answered for your gratification and wishes, unless he had known them.

“ DEAR SIR,

“ I was this day informed, that our good Bishop, Doctor French is no more. Nothing could be more gratifying to my brother Doctor Charles O'Connor, than the high honor of succeeding him, and nothing could add more to my pride. It would ill become me to mention my Brother's merits. YOU KNOW HIM. May I beg you will support him on this occasion. I regret much, that his absence prevents *his making this application to you in person*, and that the necessity of your knowing as soon as possible, *his* and my wishes on this subject does not afford time to my WRITING to his friends, and that I am obliged therefore to get my Letter PRINTED, which I hope you will excuse.

“ I am, Dear Sir,

“ Your assured humble Servant,

Dublin, May 2, 1810.

“ OWEN O'CONNOR.”

Here Rev. Sir, is treble historical evidence of your *animus* or *voluntas Episcopandi*, under the hand of the head of your own family, who knew your former and your then circumstances, and all your pretensions, views and engagements. Your first letter to a friend in Ireland under the title *Columbanus*, was published in 1810, and we are to presume on the 17th of March, as in your advertizement you inform us, that “ an anxious wish, that a subject, so

R 2

“ interest,

“ interesting to the Irish people should be submitted
 “ to their consideration on St. Patrick’s day, has*
 “ occa-

* The author of this letter unfortunately has no such apology for his misnomers and anachronisms. He has not the assurance to lay them to the account of the annual recurrence of any one festival in the whole Calendar of Saints. His inadvertent promotion of Josiah Lynch to the Arch Diocese of Tuam, in quoting the words of Dr. Nicholson, ought not to be rigorously converted into ignorance, or a wilfulness to mislead. In the first place it is unfairly stated, that *Mr. Plowden says, that Cambrensis Eversus was written by a very learned person, &c.* It would have been true, had he said, that Mr. Plowden in quoting Dr. Nicholson had, instead of *Deacon* inserted the word *Bishop*: but that he did it not wilfully, ignorantly, or maliciously may be inferred from his Letter to Sir Richard Musgrave, (p. 36,) which was published in 1805, where referring to the same quotation, will be found the word *Archdeacon*. The most learned Doctor has however followed up the weighty charge by a *negative certificate*; and that too *gratis*. Now there never was a *Mr. Josiah Lynch Titular Archbishop or Bishop of any Diocese in Ireland*. How valuable is *recondite knowledge*! Without however having access to the *data* on the shelves of Stowe, I am bold to retort, *now there is not and never was a Mr. Murphy devisee of Dr. Troy in the Archepiscopal See of Dublin*. It will not be irrelevant to the misfortune of the most learned Doctor’s having been driven out of his boasted accuracy of Chronology, by the recurrence of St. Patrick’s Festival in 1810, if we here notice some few of his other aberrations. He fastidiously boasts, (*Dodsley ubi supra*) “ that he is studious to remove all future occasion of controversy, by establishing leading events “ on the immutable basis of astronomical calculation. Proceeding on these principles, he hopes, that he may have been

“ occasioned some errors, as *Murphy* for *Murray*, at
 “ p. 12, and 503 for 498, at p. 51, for which he
 “ begs

“ able to lay the foundation of future enquiries into many
 “ points of general and local knowledge, and of a dignified
 “ and genuine erudition, and to save to future historians the
 “ labour of constant reference to documents, foreign and do-
 “ mestic for the accuracy of dates !!!” We before noticed his

ostentatious list of Anacronisms, as to the dates of the installa-
 tion and embassy of the Abbot of Hyona and his tirade against
 the Editors of Butler's Lives of Saints. He says, (2 Col. 28.)

“ This document has been published by Plowden, (Vol. I. Ap.
 “ X.) but so incorrectly, that it cannot be relied on, as pub-

“ lished by him. He dates it in 1578, instead of 1574, and
 “ yet he makes the subscribers refer to a transaction of 1579,

“ in the text. There is,” says he, (2 Col. 45) “ a confusion
 “ of dates to be guarded against, owing to the negligence of

“ some modern writers. Plowden dates, &c.” (as in pref. v.)

It is strangely ungracious in the Rev. and most learned Doctor,
 who so inexorably denied me access to the best collection of
 materials in Europe, to taunt me for having followed such do-
 cuments, as I could elsewhere collect. The dates of Desmond's
 documents, which are copied in my Appendix, may have been
 inaccurate; could I have procured more correct copies, I should
 have given them in my Historical Review. I would not have
 cast them into the Poddle. The commission from Charles for a
 cessation with the confederates, should have been dated the 11th,
 and not the 14th of January, 1642. It is not true, as the Rev.
 Doctor charges, that I make Ormond at Castlemartyr *refer to*
the King's Letter of the 2nd July, in 1643. My words are, “ He
 “ then took occasion to contest their title, and question the
 “ facts presumed or referred to in the authority, and peremp-
 “ torily rejected the condition insisted upon by the Confede-

“ begs the indulgence of his readers.” You set out
with your discovery of * “ violent rivalship and in-
“ trigues,

“ rates, of the dissolution of the present, and the calling of a
“ new Parliament; although (say I, not Ormond) the King
“ had in a letter of the 2d of July, 1643, (certainly misdated)
“ to the Lords Justices and the Marquis of Ormond, author-
“ izing them to conclude this cessation with the Confederates,
“ expressly commanded them to assure the Irish in his name,
“ that he was graciously inclined to dissolve the present Par-
“ liament, and call a new one between that and the 10th of
“ November following.” My accuser shows however, that he
considers this charge rather venial, as he graciously says of me,
as well as of my co-dabblers in Irish History, O'Halloran, and
Leland. *Is every historical fact to be rejected, because it has been
displaced?* The difference of five years between the real and
the narrated election of Pope Symmachus does not negative
the fact; nor does your Reverence's assertion, that you cau-
tioned me by letter so far back as February, 1805, prove, that
you did not honor me with two letters in February, 1802? I
incline not to question the fact of some Irish prelates having
presented to Government in 1799, resolutions, which Colum-
banus (3. Col. 18.) transposes by anachronism, to 1779. Nei-
ther will his inaccuracy as to the time of his Grand Father's
publishing his Dissertation render the fact less certain. The
reprint of that too was consigned to the Puddle. It would be
ungrateful of me, notwithstanding the severity of the stripes
from his Reverence, to pass over unheeded, the portion of in-
dulgence furnished to heal my sores. “ But shall we argue,
“ that because Keating's Chronology is erroneous, the main
“ facts are not true? As well might we say, that the whole
“ of Mr. Plowden's History is a fable, because we find here
“ and there chronological errors, misrepresentations of names,
“ of places, and of facts.” (2 Col. 79.) * 1 Col. 4.

"trigues, which disgraced the candidates for the
 "vacant see of Tuam, and that much rancour had
 "prevailed on this subject, not only amongst the
 "leading men of the second order of our clergy,
 "but amongst the Bishops themselves." * "The
 "ambitious spirit also, which betrays itself amongst
 "us, whenever an Episcopal vacancy occurs, the
 "spirit of ecclesiastical dominion, which broods
 "at Maynooth over the *exclusive* patronage of 5 mil-
 "lions of people styling that *Spiritual independance*,
 "which is in fact an uncontrouled temporal patro-
 "nage of 200,000l. per annum, and a determination
 "formed at Maynooth, to resist every lay presen-
 "tation to Catholic livings in Ireland have provoked
 "minute enquiries into the internal government of
 "our Church."† "I care not which of the rivals
 "has given most scandal. The conduct of all, so
 "jealous, so envious of each other, and their private
 "rancor exerted in public recrimination disqualify
 "them, until they return to more Christian sentiments
 "from performing the duties of a Ministry, which
 "they have profaned by wordly passions and dis-
 "graced by uproar. The sanctuary of the meek
 "and the merciful, which has been invaded by
 "ambition, must be sanctified by reconciliation and
 "humility."

Let us now see Rev. and most learned Doctor, Same sub-
ject contin-
ued,
 how you square your conduct to your principles; how

* 1 Col. 5.

† Ib. 7.

You furnish me with full historical evidence, that while the disgraceful and scandalous contest for the vacant See of Tuam was going forward, a much more irregular and shameful canvas was instituted on your behalf for the reversion of the then full See of Elphin. Your third Letter on the liberties of the Irish Church must have been written immediately after, and in consequence of the death of Dr. French, which by your brother's circular to the Clergy, he became acquainted with in Dublin on the 2nd of May 1810. You acknowledge it to your brother, to whom you say, "I observe in your kind letter of the
 " 2nd instant, additional proofs of the constancy of
 " your affection, and of the goodness of your heart.
 " But having paid this tribute of justice, and offered
 " my most cordial thanks in return I must say, that
 " I very much regret your having commenced any
 " canvas, on my behalf for the vacant diocese of
 " Elphin. *A year has elapsed*, since you first wrote
 " to me, to assist your endeavours for my promotion
 " to that See, as soon as it should be vacated by
 " the expected death of Doctor French." Here you admit the existence of a canvass for Elphin, above twelve months before the vacancy, on your behalf, and in which you performed a part. You admit, that you were privy to it; for in consequence of it, you tell us, you wrote to Doctor Troy, not that you declined the canvass, " but that nothing under Heaven
 should

should induce you to avail yourself of any means
 " whatever for attaining the object your Brother pro-
 " posed, *which were not sanctioned by the Canons of the*
 " *Catholic Church.*" To me, Rev. Doctor, you ap-
 pear to annex more consequence to letters addressed
 to you, than the writers intended. I was always at
 a loss to discover in my letter to you of the 15th of
 February, 1802, the sentiments, which in your an-
 swer of the 18th of February, 1802, you found *so*
personally flattering towards you. Now, what could
 Doctor Troy, whom you first addressed upon the
 subject, have said more or less, than what he did;
 he must have been edified at any Clergyman's *sinc-*
erely professing, *Nolo Episcopari*; but above all, would
 he approve of a Clergyman's attempting nothing
 against the Canons of the Church in forwarding
 his own promotion. Could he have told you, or could
 you out of the whole *Corpus juris canonici* have proved
 to any one, that a direct or indirect canvas by a Clergy-
 man for an Episcopal See was *canonical*. A gentle-
 man of your experience, I will not believe assumes
 much credit for the expressions of fashionable curtesy
au bout d'une lettre. 'Till your letter to Dr. Troy, and
 his answer to you upon the canvas for the See of
 Elphin be produced, no reasonable man will believe,
 that the first letter was written to prevent or obstruct
 your being forced into that See. You admit, that
 Dr. Moylan informed you by a letter from Dublin,
 that Dr. French was then in a very bad state of health,
 S and

and desired to know your *ultimate determination* with regard to your offering yourself candidate for Elphin. You pompously boast, that you have Dr. Moylan's, as well as Dr. Troy's letters amongst your papers; *in scriniis Stowensibus*, I presume. Let them appear if you wish not your countrymen to conclude, that they are refusals, or excuses from using or procuring any interest or influence, towards promoting your views and designs upon the See of Elphin. How could Dr. Moylan enquire of your *ultimate* determination, unless he had known your inchoate wishes, or perhaps your advanced efforts in forwarding the object of your brother's pride and your satisfaction. Your answer to Dr. Moylan, that it was *your final determination not to use any influence whatever in the prosecution of that design* is no denial, that you never, did use such influence: it is rather a surmise, that you had; and a very strong intimation, that your former was different from your *final* determination: it is certainly evidence of your having once had the design: and it negatives not, but favours the presumption of your wishing the design, which you do not abandon, to be carried into effect by the exertions of others, though not of your own. Another unequivocal proof of your being actively concerned in the canvas, or contest for Elphin, is your privity to your brother's application to the great anonymous *personage*, and his answer written with your concurrence, declining all interference of this kind*.

“ In

“ In that letter, he enlarges (you say) on his great
 “ regard for me, and on his opinion of my character,
 “ in terms, which it would ill become me to re-
 “ peat : and he most kindly expresses his willingness
 “ to co-operate in any other measure, which *might*
 “ *be fitting for him*, and might mark the regard he
 “ entertains for me.” An excellent character to re-
 commend you to another situation *as Librarian* :
 but no very powerful credential to the Supreme
 Bishop to appoint you a Church governor, and com-
 mit to your care and guidance a portion of his flock.
 The duties of a librarian and of a christian Bishop
 are widely different. *Obey them, that have the rule*
over you, for they watch over your souls, as being to
*give an account.** It would be unfair Rev. and most
 learned Doctor, to attribute to you any thing con-
 tained in certain unauthenticated loose columns of
 Irish Newspapers, upon these matters, that have
 accidentally come under my eye, since you have
 opened your extraordinary mission, to inform and
 reform your Catholic countrymen in the genuine
 doctrines, canonical discipline, unalienable rights, and
 indispensable duties of their religion.

I have taken in hand a severe † and awful duty, Further
proofs of
the canvas
for Elphin.
 S 2 which

* Heb. 13, 17.

† This severity of duty carries my recollection to a very
 philosophical observation, very classically expressed by the
 most learned Doctor, in his 5th Number p. 231. “ History is
 “ the severest of all studies; whilst *superficiality* is the parent of

which is to demonstrate, that it was not without grounds or proofs, that in the so often mentioned note

“ the most monstrous absurdities !!! ” The reader is apprized, that the foregoing sheets had been drawn off, before I received the invaluable treasure of “ An Historical Address on the calamities occasioned by foreign influence in the nomination of Bishops to Irish Sees. Part II. by the Rev. Charles O’Conor, D. D.” As his first address to his countrymen was ushered into public without his real name (he had not yet felt the pulse of his instigators), so the last boldly steps forward without his *nom de guerre* COLUMBANUS. His feet are now fitted to the buskin, he treads the stage with redoubled confidence, and commands his own applause. *By the shade of Columbanus you shall hear me.* (5 Col. 138.)

Sume superbiam

Quæsitam meritis.

With conscious pride, most learn’d Divine,
Assume the honors justly thine.

Francis’s Horace, L. 3. Ode xxx.

He has dropped his *mauvaise honte*, as he formerly washed off his paint. He assumes a loftier tone, and under the imposing text from Isaiah (C. lviii.) he announces his 5th Evangelical *Epistola ad Hybernos*. *Clama ne cesses, quasi tuba exalta vocem.* Although his friend, Lord Redesdale, in 1805, informed his brother Peers in his speech on the Catholic Question, that “ the Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland were a body, who tyrannized over the rest of the Catholics, differing from the rest of Europe : nor could any peace be kept in Ireland, so long as they remained unabolished : for to their influence was owing all the misconduct of their flocks. And that to the generality of the Catholic body, the abolition of the Hierarchy would be extremely grate-

note in the 3d volume of my last history, I made
some observations tending to indicate the part cast for
You,

ful; and that the natives of Ireland from the nature of their educa-
tion are well acquainted with Latin." (Hist. of Ireland since
the Union, 2 Vol. 97.) Yet I still believe, that most of your
countrymen know more of the Saxon, than of the Roman tongue,
and I shall therefore for their benefit put the English [version
of his text before them. *Cry aloud—spare not—lift up thy voice,*
like a trumpet. Some of Columbanus's (now the Rev. Charles
O'Connor's) countrymen have wondered, that as the first verse of
the 58th chapter of Isaiah raised his voice for their reform,
the second verse did not suggest to him a striking likeness of
his country. "Yet they seek me daily, and delight to know
my ways, as a nation, that did righteousness, and forsook not
the ordinance of their God: they ask of me the ordinances
of justice; they take delight in approaching to God," The
Rev. Seer, in the blaze of historical information, with which he
has overwhelmed his readers, has unfortunately omitted to in-
form them on what occasion, at what time, and from what altar,
the Seraph laid the live coal upon his lips, that took away his
iniquity, purged his sin, and rendered him worthy of addressing
the very *Great Man*, whose name he once *durst not to mention*.
He confidently dedicates his last evangelical labours to *The most*
Noble the Marquis of Buckingham. The first puff of incense how-
ever, which rises from the censer, is what is ever uppermost in
the dedicator's thoughts. *The merits, whatever there may be, in the*
following sheets, &c. (vide the dedication). He resumes the fa-
vorite theme. "They possess, however, one *merit*, which from
the honour of a long acquaintance, I am sure must recom-
mend them to a mind such as your's that of very *honestly, ve-*
ry plainly, and perhaps, very *forcibly*, submitting to a nation,
whom you always respected and esteemed, and cherished,
truths of the greatest importance to its prosperity; as tend-

You Rev. and most learned Doctor, *to perform in the grand confederacy to alter the religion and extinguish the natural*

“ing to elucidate and confirm the several relations, which the
 “NOBILITY, GENTRY, CLERGY, and PEOPLE of
 “Ireland mutually bear to each other, in support of that Con-
 “stitutional form of Government to which, under God, we
 “look for our national prosperity.” The acquisition of this
 invaluable *thesaurus Veritatum*, which came to hand many
 days, after I had completed the manuscript of this letter, will
 enable me to amend it, by enforcing several of the observations,
 which I have made upon the *very honest*, the *very plain*, and the *very*
forcible truths, submitted by the *ci-devant soi disant Columbanus* to
 his countrymen. It must be here remarked, that the seraphic
 purification has not only emboldened the Rev. Doctor to men-
 tion the name of his *munificent, invigorating, and cheering patron*,
 but nominally, and specifically to attribute all the MERIT of
 his Epistles *ad Hibernos* to that high patronage. Having with
 the prophetic trumpet blasted into confusion and flight the vi-
 zors and armour of nicknames and no-names, of duplicity and
 disguise, he confidently advances to battle, putting off those
 cumbersome ornaments, and with redoubled ferocity assails Doc-
 tor Milner, and all the host of his antagonists, in the name of
Charles O’Canor; as David met Goliath with his sling and stones.
 His stone has not yet sunk into the forehead of his opponent.
 He lacks the faith of David; and brings unto his aid and noto-
 riety the indefatigable partner of his toils and battles. In de-
 fiance of Irish Statutes, he puts upon the staff without qua-
 lification, the director and superintendant-general of his corps
 of sappers, miners, and *civil engineers*. He brings him forward
 arrayed with that pomp of triumph, which fits the *man, whom*
the King delights to honor. (5 Col. 23.) “Would such a man, as
 “my learned friend Mr. Charles Butler, of Lincoln’s Inn Fields,
 “at any period of his life, lend himself to such a prostitution

national spirit of your country. It has been shewn in evidence, that in the years 1809 and 1810, an extensive

“ of his abilities? Could he be tempted by a beggarly subscription to set at defiance the most sacred Canons of the Catholic Church?” He has in a word, assured us in his postscript to this last work, that Doctor Milner *has been repeatedly put out of the society and intercourse of the English Catholics: and that he has menaced with excommunication his brethren the four Prelates of the English Catholic Church.* I scruple not here to charge Doctor O’Conor, as he has now dropt the title of Columbanus, with unwarrantably using the words *of the English Catholics.* I admit and lament, that a very considerable portion of the higher orders of the English Catholics have been seduced by the insidious, disguised, half avowed, and half denied doctrines of blue books and their consequences; of which, were they thoroughly aware, they would, I am confident, renounce them, as Lord Grenville, and others, have the Veto. The restless spirit of the managers of the quaint conceit for metamorphosing *Papists, or Roman Catholics* (call them which you will, they are the same) into *protesting Catholic Dissenters; a description of persons wholly unknown to our laws,* (vide Blue Book, signed by Mr. Charles Butler, Secretary), and the vindictive soreness, that followed the contemptuous rejection of that lubricous whimsey, have been constantly working under cover for these last twenty years, to bring about those consequences, which were originally meant to be concealed from its advocates and supporters; viz. an *Utrecht* establishment of a National Church independent of the See of Rome. The bulk of English Catholics I aver to be satisfied with their appellation, and their creed. The Rev. Doctor O’Conor is not warranted in fixing the whole body of English Catholics with abetting and maintaining his doctrines. Too many of my countrymen and brethren in faith, I admit, have unguardedly been seduced; but were the treacherous

tensive canvas was instituted during the life of Dr. French to secure for *You* the See of Elphin on his demise;

wrappers once fairly unfolded, they would recoil with horror at the sight of the poison they contain. Awfully dreadful was the judgment of God upon Arius in the 4th Century, who by insidious, subtle, and artful professions concealed his heresy, imposed upon the Emperor Constantine and the Catholic Prelates, and made such progress with his errors, as to have threatened the destruction of the Universal Church.

Columbanus has both unwarrantably and inconsistently asserted, (2 Col. 32) “ Now if religion was not the cause of our
 “ national hatred to Englaud, neither was it the cause of the
 “ penal laws.” To prove this, he goes on to say, that “ Peter
 “ Walsh, who was intimate with the Duke of Ormond, justly
 “ ascribes the penal laws, since the Reformation, to other
 “ causes.” Then Columbanus gives by way of proving his own thesis, (and therefore adopting) the words of Walsh; amongst which are the following. “ We have no cause to wonder at the
 “ Protestant’s jealousy of us, when they see the three several
 “ tests hitherto made use of, for trying the affection of Roman
 “ Catholics in these kingdoms, in relation to the *Papal* pretensions on one side, and the Royal rights of the other; I mean
 “ the Oath of Supremacy first, (I admit the lawfulness of the Oath of *Allegiance*, and of the *Loyal Formulary*, and only insist upon the unlawfulness of the Oath of Supremacy) “ all
 “ three one after another, to have been *with so much rashness, and*
 “ *wilfulness, and obstinacy, declined, opposed, traduced, and rejected:*
 “ albeit no authority or power, not even *by the Oath of Supre-*
 “ *macy itself*, be attributed to the King, save only civil, or that
 “ of the sword; nor any spiritual or ecclesiastical power be denied to the Pope, save only, that which the General Council
 “ of *Ephesus*, and the next of *Chalcedon*, and the 217 Bishops of

demise; that you were privy to it from the beginning; that your brother wrote to you to assist *his*
T
endeavours

“Africa, whereof St. Augustine was one, both in their Canons and letters too, in the case of *Apollinarius*, denied unto the Roman Bishops of their time.” This oath of supremacy has furnished Columbanus with an admirable opportunity of exercising his *Arian* lubricity; it has thrown him into a convulsive wriggle: and he may boast not only of his having eluded the gripe of Doctor Pointer, but he may perhaps have reason to plume himself with the honour of having since, that time, fascinated that Prelate, and some others with his insidious sophisms, and plausible quotations. *Arius* by the artful application of scriptural phrases cozened the Emperor Constantine and the Catholic Prelates into a temporary belief of his orthodoxy; and in the very crisis of the heretical ovation, the deluded civil magistrate most unwarrantably ordered the Bishop of Constantinople to admit *Arius* without retractation of his heresy into the bosom of the Church. (His incompetency to encroach upon the spiritual power was precisely the same, whether Christian, Catholic, Heathen, or Arian). On the eve of the Sunday, on which he was to have been solemnly admitted into the bosom of the Church, under the Imperial mandate, he was led about in triumph by his arrogant and outrageous followers, when an awful visitation of God came upon him, in sight of the very church, in which the Bishop was, on the next day, to have submitted to the usurping order of the civil magistrate. He was suddenly forced, by a call of nature, to quit the procession, and like Judas, whom he had followed in treacherously betraying his Divine Master, he instantly expired, in apparent impenitence, *and all his bowels gushed out*. Now reader mark the working of *Columbanian honesty*. Perhaps, *the last error shall be worse than the first*. (5 Col. 283.) “Do I then recommend

endeavours for your promotion to that See, that you were greatful to your brother * for the eager part he

“ it to my countrymen to take the Oath of Supremacy? I
 “ have already unequivocally declared, *that I do not.*” Then,
 in a note he refers to 1 Col. 91. and adds, “ I leave it to the
 “ candor of my countrymen to judge what credit is due to that
 “ *Prelate*, who has the effrontery to say, that *I recommend it to my*
 “ *countrymen to take the Oath of Supremacy.* This is a deliberate
 “ falsehood, and the dishonesty of it is aggravated by his nume-
 “ rous *false* quotations of my words. What would history be,
 “ were it to rest on the *assertions* of a man so utterly insensible of
 “ the sacredness of truth?” The passage, in which Columbanus
 says, he unequivocally declared, he did not recommend the tak-
 ing of the Oath of Supremacy, certainly contains some of his
 ambiguous praise of our ancestors, who refused to take it *so*
worded, and so proposed, which the Government of that day attempt-
ed to ram down their throats with Mahomedan violence. Is Mr.
Perceval less of the Mahomedan Ramm er than *Cecil*? “ Yet
 “ he says, it must in common justice, be acknowledged, that
 “ the title of the *Head of the Church*, though odious to a Catho-
 “ lic, means no more in the acceptation of an Englishman, than
 “ *temporal Head of the Church, or Defender of the Faith.*” Thus,
 according to Columbanus, if an Englishman be a *Catholic*, he
 ceases to be, or to comprehend as an *Englishman*. He concludes:
 “ This is the explanation, which the English Divines give of
 “ their own principles, and no one has a right to attribute
 “ to them principles which they utterly disavow.” Then the
 hallucinating Doctor, in order to decoy and deceive, refers in
 a note to the authority of King James, and at the end of it
 abuses him, as he occasionally does every one he names. “ Had

* 3 Col. 1.

he had taken in forwarding what he deemed most likely to contribute to your happiness, that you

T 2

wrote

“ this vile pedant been as conciliatory in his manners and answers to the Irish Delegates in 1613, as he was studious to shew his learning (this propensity frets Columbanus into frenzy) and to boast of his Protestantism, of which, however, he was not a sincere advocate, the Irish would *have long ere now acceded to a negative on the part of the civil power !!!* But *Deus quos vult perdere dementat.* Masson explains the Oath of English Supremacy as James does” Withhold thine indignation and horror, reader, when thou findest the quotations made from James, apply not to *the Oath of Supremacy*, which that Monarch truly said, in the very work cited by Columbanus (*Apology for the Oath*) “ was devised for putting a difference between Papists and them of our profession” ; but to the Oath of *Allegiance*, which he had himself framed, and which Paul V. solemnly declared by a bull, could *not be admitted with the integrity of Catholic faith.* I must (in common, I presume with the English and Irish Catholic Clergy and laity, who with the consent and approbation of their spiritual superiors have generally taken the English Oath of the 31st of the King, or the Irish Oath of the 33d of his Majesty, differing little from it) consider myself to have substantially sworn King James’s Oath. Now *as the integrity of Catholic faith cannot vary with times and circumstances*, it follows, that every one, who has taken the English or Irish Oath of the present King, must hold the condemnation of James’s Oath, which is of the same import, to have been unwarrantable, and an erroneous declaration or judgment. The different Oaths are given in the Appendix, No. II. in order, that the impartial reader may satisfy his mind by comparison. (N. B. not of MSS. or unpublished works) The grossness, infidelity, and

wrote to Dr. Troy upon the subject, that an application was made to Dr. Moylan upon it, and that the matter was strongly solicited to be forwarded by the influence of the Marquis of Buckingham (the person of high distinction I am to presume *whose name you dare not to mention*), that Dr. Troy and Dr. Moylan either declined or failed in their interference, that the most Noble Marquis declined forwarding your views, but expressed a willingness to co-operate in any other measure, which might be fitting for him, and might mark

impudence, (*eum oportet esse bene & naviter impudentem*) with which this deception is attempted to be imposed on his readers will hardly be credited. I shall give in English, a faithful translation of the words of James, quoted by Columbanus, which apply entirely to his oath of *allegiance* in contradistinction to Elizabeth's Oath of *Supremacy*. "With so much attention, and so much anxiety did I take care, that nothing should be contained in this oath beyond a profession of that loyalty and civil and temporal obedience, which nature itself prescribes. It has been thought proper, that I should publish an apology for this oath, in which I did undertake to prove, that there was nothing contained in it, but what belonged to mere civil and temporal obedience, such as is due to Sovereign Princes, from their subjects." Irishmen and Englishmen beware, Catholics and Protestants beware. *History frowns down with indignant contempt on every effort to mislead.* (5 Col. 283) Can the taking of an oath be more strongly recommended, than by attempting to prove, that when tendered, it had been declined, opposed, traduced, and rejected with much rashness, and wilfulness, and obstinacy?

mark the regard he entertained for you ;* that upon the whole, the first canvas failed : that the second canvas was begun the very day your brother knew of Dr. French's death, that you were made privy to it by letter written on that same day; that it failed, and some time after it's failure, *you regretted his having commenced any canvas on your behalf for the vacant diocese of Elphin.* The mummary of a candidate being put in nomination by a third person is played off on the corrupt hustings of every rotten borough in the Empire. The extent, zeal and perseverance in the canvas negative the coexistence of any religious objection, conscientious difficulty, or honorable bar to your attainment of the object of the canvas, namely a See in the Catholic Hierarchy of Ireland.

I have perceived in the irregular skirmishes between you Rev. Doctor, and some of your antagonists, fastidious efforts to falsify assertions, to refute arguments, and to negative or establish facts, that affect not the *gist* of the case. Thus, the collection of your

Columbanus's indecent attack of his own Hierarchy.

* Such was the *stilus curiæ*, which Columbanus seems long to have imbibed, concluding his letter to me of the 11th of February 1802 with a reference to the subject of it, *which he should be delighted to forward in any other way, that I might think in his power :* and that of the 18th of the same month, which ends with a *sincere proffer of friendship in any other way I might think consistent with the principles of that letter.*

your grandfather's* books and papers were placed on the inaccessible shelves of Stowe, whether the legal

* How widely do the sentiments of that excellent personage, and good Irishman, differ from those of his degenerate grandson. In the preface to the 2d edition of his Dissertations, xiii. he allows great merit to Dr. Leland, to whose care it was owing, *that these original Chronicles have not again fallen into private hands.* Compare therefore, and fully weigh the effects of the words of the grandfather, speaking of himself in the same preface, v. “*Some worthy persons however, who have supplied him with new materials enabled him to renew the subject,*” with those of the grandson in his letter to me, of the 18th February, 1802, “*I sometime since gave them together with the originals, to the Marquis of Buckingham, who is possessed of the greatest part of my grandfather's papers.*” (Vide what is said upon this subject, from 54 to 72). From the last production of the *cytevant soi disant Columbanus* it seems, that the mysterious translation of the O'Connor collection, from Balanagare to Stowe, still haunts the *not uninvigorated or uncheered Librarian*:

Hæret lateri lethalis Arundo.

Still the fatal dart

Sticks in his side and rankles in his heart.

Dryd. Virg. 4 Æn.

I wished to have roused the Rev. Charles O'Connor, to come forward and explain to his countrymen, by what means, the patriotic wishes, the indefatigable and costly labours, and the laudable views of the great and virtuous *Charles O'Connor* had been so cruelly and unnaturally thwarted and defeated. Little will his countrymen rest satisfied, with what he says upon this subject, (5 Col. 149). “*The honest V. B. of Castabala, finding, that he cannot refute Columbanus (no very arduous task) endeavours by the most impudent falsehoods, invented by*

gal right to them vested in your father and uncle, as a part of the personal estate of your intestate grandfather, *himself*, to blacken a character, *that stands in his way*, (how so?) "and to level it down to the condition of his own! Guilt of a ****, which no layman of common education would venture upon, he *dares* to assert, that *I stole my grandfather's MSS. and sold them*: an assertion, which *one of the greatest men in England knows to be false.*" Why is the great man still to remain anonymous? Columbanus's lips have been purified, and after the flattering preface to the Marquis of Buckingham, it is hardly conceived, why delicacy should still shroud the great man in mystery. The recondite knowledge of an anonymous being, however great, goes but a little way in making out a legal title to property. Were not the nation injured by the amotion (Columbanus may use a more appropriate term) of the grandfather's collection, it would have been a private, a dark transaction, indifferent to the public, between a vendor and a vendee, with mutual covenants of indemnity, and perhaps some subsequent and not altogether voluntary confirmations from those claiming *legally* under the grandfather, and *patriotically* under the contributors to that valuable collection. Had it not also been a fact of notorious flagrancy, that Columbanus had in his five Addresses both injured and insulted his countrymen, the acceptance of a dedication of the 5th Address, from Doctor Charles O'Connor, D. D. by the Marquis of Buckingham, would to them, have been a matter of indifference or contempt. It pointedly negatives the adulatory averment of the Dedicator, that his *Lordship's name is justly respected by every description of persons in his native country.* It will add little to his Lordship's *Mæcænetic* fame. For no man, who does, or who may hereafter know the character and qualities of Columbanus, will adopt the sympathies of Cicero. (12 Ep. L. 5.) *qui non tantum laudari se letatur, sed addit etiam, a laudato viro,*" who not only rejoices at being praised, but he adds also, by a praise-worthy man.

father, or whether the huge expence, which Lord Buckingham incurred, in obtaining possession of them, arose from payment, of annuities or sums in gross, or consisted in patronage, in largess, in countenance, in honor, in promise, or in nothing at all. Equally true is it, that you Rev. Sir, have not been chosen Vicar Capitular of the diocese of Elphin, whether your name were mentioned in the chapter, whether you were put in nomination and rejected, or whether any other person were postulated for that See. Some months after the failure of the canvas on your behalf, (I go not the length of saying *in consequence* of that failure) you unmask yourself, you unsheath your sword, throwing away the scabbard, and with an appropriate parole *Irishmen beware*, yourself a host, you take the field and proclaim interminable war against your hierarchy : and that in a stile and manner so sublime and dignified, that I question not, that your lofty patron would, if warmly solicited, now use his influence in promoting your Reverence to the See of Ossory, to replace the learned, virtuous and firm* Prelate, whose lamented death has made an opening for another canonical election. I will not apologize to my readers for *offending pious ears* with any thing *ill sounding, ill smelling &c.* ;† but nothing short of literal repetition, otherwise correct quotation, would be believed : and it

* Right Rev. Dr. Lanigan, recently deceased, who was one of the first and firmest opposers of the *Veto*.

† 4 Col. 26 c. 27.

it is necessary, that both your countrymen, and my countrymen should be apprized of the qualities and attainments of this modern reformer of the Catholic church of Ireland.

* “ *Irishmen beware!* Take heed, that this *secret*
 “ Hierarchy of invisible conscience may not fly away
 “ to the highest Heavens with the substantial inde-
 “ pendence of your invisible Hierarchy on earth;
 “ and that whilst you are eager for the preservation
 “ of a phantom, you may not lose the reality. This
 “ secret invisible Hierarchy of conscience holds se-
 “ cret synods, shuts the doors of those synods against
 “ the second order of the clergy, votes away the *Gal-*
 “ *lican liberties*, sends *secret* addresses to the castle,
 “ betrays in those addresses the prescriptive rights of
 “ the Priesthood, makes war upon *Canonical Elec-*
 “ *tions*, which are prescribed by *general* councils, be-
 “ queaths our dioceses to favourites, decides even in
 “ *temporals* for the second order of the Clergy without
 “ consulting them, and in short is a very blessed and
 “ independent hierarchy *for itself*. *Irishmen beware.*”

“ The following passage from Hudibras relates to
 “ a species of Independent Church, which existed
 “ in the reign of Charles.”

“ As wind i'th' hypocondre's pent
 Is but a blast of downward sent;
 But if it upward chance to fly,
 Becomes new light and prophecy:
 So when our speculations tend
 Above their just and lawful end,

Although

Although they promise strange and great,
Discoveries of things far set;
They are but idle dreams and fancies
And savour strongly of the Ganzas!

You, Rev. and most learned Doctor, must have been induced by a treble motive to translate into a learned language, this sublime soar of the facetious Butler. 1°. To express more emphatically your high sense of the *simile*. 2°. To propagate and perpetuate it through nations, which are strangers to the English, but may know something of the Latin tongue. 3°. To convince your patron, that although he could not be induced to cooperate in pushing your Reverence into the See of Elphin, yet that he (and others) might be convinced of your abilities to translate into Latin verse the old metrical annals of your country: and therefore a fit Bibliothecarian to the great man, who alone is worthy to be compared with Ormond.

Sic hypocondriacis inclusa meatibus aura
Desinet in crepitum,* si fertur prona per alvum.
Sed si summa petat, mentisque ferierit arcem,
Divinus furor est, & conscia flamma futuri.

May I repeat. *Nec satis apparet cur versus facilet &c.*
Certé furit &c.

I wish

* It is presumed, that the Rev. and most learned Doctor does not affect to suit the palate, or flatter the taste of his patron, even in the bitterness of invective against gentlemen, whom he honours with a mock canonization for having advocated the

I wish you Rev. and most learned Doctor, to understand once for all, that I go cordially with you in all the explicit truths you have written in your five letters: * but though I could not follow you

General
Charges a-
gainst Co-
lumbanus.

U 2

step

emancipation of Ireland, (a Saint Cobbett, Saint Finnerty, and
 “ a Saint Horne Tooke) 1 Col. 27. “ I little expected, that
 “ men, who but a few days ago, made Popery, idolatry, and
 “ slavery, synonymous, and spewed into each other’s mouths
 “ all the rancid putrefactions of theological indigestion, which
 “ have been so often vomited, and so often licked up in the
 “ course of the last century, would now affect the *come-round*,
 “ & be the advocates for that very Popery, which they so hearti-
 “ ly abhor. Perhaps those good men have been on a pilgrimage
 “ to the Well of St. Winefred ! Perhaps they are really con-
 “ verted to Popery. Saints ! Innocents !” This delicate sub-
 limation was worthy of an Arch Mitre. *Et vitula tu dignus*.
 How pure, refined, and rectified a spirit ! How depurated, how
 completely defecated from all earthly dross !!!

* The Rev. and most learned *Columbanus* must not imagine, that he has an exclusive patent for investigating truth ; he has certainly the advantages of many, in the exclusive access to a very valuable collection of documents for the truth of Irish history ; he is entrusted with the severe custody of the golden fruit of the western island, *Sacerdos Hesperidum templi custos*. But I am bold to say, that if the Rev. and most learned Doctor will condescend to compare my *Church and State*, published in 1796, by Robinsons Pater Noster Row, with his five letters to his countrymen it will expand and rectify his ideas, which, from his printed works bespeak a lamentable state of ignorance, obscurity, confusion, and contradiction, upon the interesting subjects of spiritual and temporal power, the rights and duties of

step by step through 19 true propositions, it would be unseemly to permit you to impose upon your countrymen

the civil magistrate and church governors, the difference between order and jurisdiction, the obligation or nullity of Papal bulls and canon law, the established and gospel maintenance of the ministry, the competency and inability of alliances between Church and State, the variations of oaths from the laws, on which they are ingrafted, the true and real mischiefs of Ultramontanism and the fair and sound sense and application of the Gallican propositions. He will find, that the fair and obvious deductions from a thorough, orderly, and impartial enquiry, into all these important, delicate, and inflammable subjects prove to demonstration the utter incompetency of the civil magistrate to give, take away, or meddle with spiritual jurisdiction, the unlawfulness of any Roman Catholic taking the Oath of Supremacy, as it is worded, and the sinfulness of becoming a member of the established church, in any person conscientiously holding the necessity of an universal Bishop, and of a living, speaking tribunal to settle all controversies in the Church, and preserve her in truth and unity. (Columbanus, 1 Col. 97, says Grotius *papizans* thought so). I said, in 1796, what I now repeat, (Ch. & St. p. 519.) “It ought to be seriously observed
 “by all the Roman Catholic subjects of his Majesty, how little
 “obnoxious they would be in the eyes of their Protestant brethren, if they always confined their submission to the pure
 “*spiritual* supremacy of the head of the hierarchy in the see
 “of Rome, as by their religious belief they admit it to exist,
 “and as they lately have by their oath, sworn only to maintain it.” With reference to that oath, in as much it was a virtual renunciation of the *Tory* doctrine of indefeasible and *jure divino* right to the Monarchy, and of the ultramontane doctrines of any direct or indirect temporal power of the Pope over Kings and Princes, I there said, (p. 96.) “The English

countrymen furtively and maliciously a 20th false proposition, which would involve them in broad unequivocal schism from the Catholic Church, with which they have communed with exemplary firmness and fidelity through three centuries of lure, menace and persecution. Do not flatter yourself, that I allow your veracity to preponderate in any such proportion. You shall not lay to my account any tender hesitation. From me you will not hear or read, *No proposition in Columbanus's works can be laid hold on; yet they are novel.* It is not easy to discover his meaning, yet there is an obvious meaning.†* That obvious meaning I undertake to

“Roman Catholics may therefore be now properly styled “sworn Whigs and Cisalpines.” I have perhaps urged some truths with more warmth, than either the Rev. Doctor, or his prototype Peter Walsh; but with very different views, inferences, and applications. N. B. In referring him to my *Church and State*, I inform him where it may be had, and how long it has been before the public; not as his Reverence does to his *prologomena* to the Irish Annals, (3 Col. 60) to the epistolatory preface to the Irish Annals, (Ib. 67) and compare my *Epistle Prefat. to the Irish Annals*, p. cxii. (4 Col. 13). None of which have to my knowledge yet appeared before the public.”
 “These customs are more fully explained in a MSS. work of mine, on the *Religion of the Pagan Irish of the 5th Century.*” (3 Col. 82.)

* 4 Col. 7.

† The Rev. Doctor, must not imagine that I ever trembled before the tribunal of manly, rational, and public investigation, (1

to develope to those, who cannot discern in them either any meaning at all, or who are too unsuspicious to discover the deleterious poison lurking in your real and obvious, but by no means *new meaning*. I distinctly then charge you, Rev. Dr. Charles O'Connor, D. D. heretofore (assuming the *Nom de Guerre of Columbanus*) with wilfully misrepresenting important historical facts, with broaching dangerous doctrines, with distorting obvious truths, with drawing false and malicious conclusions, with propagating unfounded and scandalous slanders of the Governors of the Catholic Church of Ireland, and their flocks, with a deliberate, insidious, and wicked design of seducing your countrymen from that Church Government, to which all their Christian ancestors have immemorially submitted, and to erect themselves into a schismatical *national Church*, such as is that of England, which threw off all submission to the universal Bishop, under Henry VIII. and with recommending the taking of that Oath of Supremacy, which King James I. said, *was devised for putting a difference between Papists and them of our profession.** All this
(and

Col. 10) My opinion is, that truth courts investigation: *veritas nil veretur nisi abscondi*. But woe to those, who abuse, distort or misapply it.

* Vid. History of Ireland since the Union 3 vol. p. 686.

It cannot be too frequently repeated, that the maintenance of many truths justifies not the assertion of one falsehood. Genuine submission to the Christian revelation admits not of

(and much more) could I charge you with having published in 5 printed letters or addresses to your countrymen

deviation from it in a single point. It is not, because the overstrained doctrines of ultramontaniam have heretofore produced great mischiefs, that Peter Walsh was justified in rising generally against his spiritual superiors, and broaching unsound doctrines in religion, or because Catholics ought to admit plenitude of temporal power in the *Civil Magistrate*, and renounce it altogether in the Pope, therefore is it lawful for a Catholic to swear, *that no foreign Prince, Person, Prelate, State, or Potentate, hath, or ought to have any jurisdiction, power, pre-eminence, or authority ecclesiastical or spiritual within this realm.* According to the import, and universal usage of the English language, from the days of Henry VIII. (we are with humiliating redundancy compelled to swear in the plain and ordinary sense of the words) to the present, it is impossible so to construe this oath, that any person admitting a supremacy of dignity and jurisdiction in the Bishop of Rome over all Christendom, can take it with a safe conscience. For refusing it, Sir Thomas More, and Bishop Fisher were executed; and Lord Grenville thought it *framed with a captious desire to exclude Catholics.* A genuine Catholic of Ireland believes in the 19th century, as St. Ambrose did in the 4th. *Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia.* Believing, that the charter, which Christ left for the government of his church, reaches to every spot of the terraqueous globe, and that the supremacy of jurisdiction, by which his kingdom is governed, is vested in the successor of St. Peter, he cannot swear, that by exemption, renunciation, expulsion, deprivation, resumption, usurpation, or any act of the civil magistrate, the successor of Peter, neither hath nor ought to have any jurisdiction, or pre-eminence, *ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm.* In the note of my history, which concerns Columbanus, I said, that “when the *Protesting Ca-*

trymen, since the unsuccessful canvass for advancing you to the See of Elphin. I must not, however leave you

“*thelic Dissenters* broached certain doctrines, which bore too
 “ hard upon the spiritual supremacy of the head of the Chris-
 “ tian hierarchy, I wrote (in 1790) the *Case stated*, which op-
 “ pugned them.” I also generally charged, “ that Mr. But-
 “ ler, the writer of the famous blue books published at that
 “ time against the power & jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome,
 “ and Columbanus were *duo laborantes in Unum* :” and I am free to
 say, that the introduction of such doctrines into the bodies of
 the English and Irish Catholics, must necessarily produce schism;
 a consequence to be dreaded by every true Catholic. I pro-
 ceed to clear myself of the imputation of making assertions
 without proofs. The most learned Doctor has, by quoting Pe-
 ter Walsh, and by frequently referring to his case, and ap-
 plauding all he wrote, identified, as far as he could, their two
 cases. I have before remarked that he states (2 Col. 33) “ the
 “ oath of supremacy to have been with much rashness and
 “ wilfulness, and obstinacy declined, opposed, traduced, and
 “ rejected.” I do not dissemble, that I have ever considered,
 that the views and object of the blue books, and of those, who
 wrote or approved of them, were to withdraw the Catholic Bo-
 dy from the Papal jurisdiction, and erect a schismatical cong-
 regation, or set of Christians independent of the See of Rome,
 answering Columbanus’s idea of a national church, upon the
 Jansenistical model of that of Utrecht. Against such attempts
 I ever have, and whilst I have life, ever shall set my face.
 Therefore in my *Church and State* (p. 568) after having expli-
 citly set forth the origin, nature, effects, inconsistency, and
 abuse of the oath of supremacy, I said, “ For these reasons,
 “ I must essentially differ from an elegant modern writer upon
 “ these subjects (*Mr. Berrington’s Introduction to the Memoirs of*
 “ *Gregorio*

you grounds, for fancying, that you ever had, or shall have reason to charge me *truly and fairly* with making

X

“ *Gregorio Panzani, p. 11.*) who attempts to prove, that such has
 “ been the legal acceptation of the Oath from its enactment to the pre-
 “ sent day, and who holding the lawfulness of the present oath,
 “ thus interrogates his Roman Catholic countrymen. *Why*
 “ *should we importune Government for a further redress of grievan-*
 “ *ces, or complain, that we are aggrieved, if the remedy be in our*
 “ *own hands? One bold man, by taking the oath, may dissipate the*
 “ *whole charm of prejudice, and restore us the most valuable privilege*
 “ *of British Citizens.* I hope it will have appeared to my readers,
 “ from what I have already said, that the imposers of this Oath
 “ of Supremacy look upon the subscription to it as an actual
 “ renunciation of the Roman Catholic faith, and that the plain
 “ and necessary meaning of the words of it, imports an abso-
 “ lute renunciation of a religious tenet, which is holden as an
 “ essential term of communion with her.” This sacerdotal tri-
 umvirate of *bold men* have thus publicly announced their opini-
 ons, in order, it must be presumed, to induce others to take
 that oath, palpably unlawful for a Roman Catholic to take,
 though I never heard, that Friar Peter Walsh, the Rev. Mr.
 Joseph Berrington, or the Rev. Doctor Charles O’Conor, ever
 set the example by taking it themselves. The anti-papal doc-
 trines of Walsh will more fully appear in the parallel drawn be-
 tween his and those of Columbanus in the Appendix, No. III.
 Some of the opinions of Mr. Joseph Berrington become of more
 consequence to the body of English Catholics, in as much, as
 he was one of the two Priests of the second order, (the Rev.
 Mr. Wilkes, a Benedictin Monk, was the other, and is dead),
 whom the Committee of the *would-be* *Protesting Catholic Dissen-*
sers associated to their board, in order to avail themselves of the

making assertions without proofs. I proceed therefore still *gagging* in monotony, whether it be in the
gabble

wisdom and experience of these two *jure divino* judges of faith and discipline, who concurred in, and approved of by signing the blue books, and the protest against their Bishops contained in them. And these two are the persons, of whom that Committee said to the Bishops, *We are convinced, that we have not have been misled by our Clergy.* For this protest, and some other matters tending to disclose the general nature of that controversy between the *would-be Protesting Catholic Dissenters*, and their lawful Bishops, so unseasonably revived and fiercely argued by Columbanus, will be found in the Appendix, No. IV. It must be remarked, that the necessary consequence of the doctrines of the blue books, and the views of the Committee of *would-be Protesting Catholic Dissenters*, *Schism*, is very industriously kept by them out of sight. It also has been studiously thrown into the very dark back ground of the movements of the self-appointed board of British Catholics, and the devisers, fabricators, and promoters of the mystical fifth resolution, or rider to the Petition of the English Roman Catholics, noticed in the third volume of my Post Union History (p. 787.) That unfortunate difference of the *would-be Protesting Catholic Dissenters* from their brethren, who wished to retain their name and title with their creed, and submission to their Bishops, was an inchoate schism, which had it been persevered in, would have fatally verified the assertion of St. Ignatius in the first century of the Christian Æra, *Quotquot Dei & Jesu Christi sunt, hi Cum Episcopo sunt.* *As many as belong to God and Jesus Christ, are with the Bishop.* No man of sound intellects can be blind to the identity of spirit, principles, doctrines, views, and tendency of the conduct and publications of the *would-be Protesting*

gabble of the Conaught wildgoose, the Mantuan swan, or Hudibrastic ganza.

I cannot fix the precise date to the birth of your Reverence's antipathy to Papal Supremacy. In the spring of 1810, I find you asserting (a sound Divine might say very unwarrantably as a Roman Catholic)*

Columbanus' anti-papacy.

“that neither the *election* of Bishops by the Pope,
X 2 “nor

Catholic Dissenters, the Board of British Catholics, the seducers of Lords Grey and Grenville and Messrs. Ponsonby, Grattan, and other political friends of Catholic Ireland into the *Veto*, (which they have since renounced) and this anti-papal triumvirate. In Mr. Berrington's *State and behaviour of English Catholics*, (2d Ed. 152) he says, “In Catholic countries must be
“looked for the proper display of the Papal power: and it will
“be found, that its sphere of action is exceedingly bounded.
“They acknowledge in him a *primacy* of jurisdiction; but it is
“a primacy subject to the controul of Canons, and to the general order of established laws. His power is in no sense absolute. It is his duty to attend to the execution of established laws, and to take care, that the Christian republic receive
“no injury. This is the office of a first magistrate in every
“well-regulated state. And to shew, how limited his authority really is; we maintain that each Pastor in his parish,
“each Bishop, in his Diocese, each Metropolitan in his province, and each Patriarch in his nation is possessed of a proper and essential jurisdiction, wholly uncontrollable by, and
“independent of the See of Rome. They respect his primacy:
“but they have their rights and liberties as ancient and as sacred, as are his own. Such was the order divinely established
“by Christ.”

* 1 Col. 80.

“ nor their *confirmation* by him after election, nor
 “ their nomination to any vacant See, nor the
 “ Pope’s *consent*, nor even his *knowledge* of the ap-
 “ pointment, is a necessary requisite to establish the
 “ validity of any of these acts.” And again,* “ The
 “ Pope’s supremacy consists in a power given by our
 “ Saviour to St. Peter, of inspecting the conduct of all
 “ orders of the hierarchy, so as to take care, not
 “ that they shall have such church discipline, as he
 “ may think proper to impose: *not that we shall have*
 “ *Bishops of his nomination.*” Then you inform your
 countrymen that † “ our ancestors suffered martyr-
 “ dom, not for the Pope’s *temporal* power of nomi-
 “ nating to Irish Bishopricks, or of transferring Ireland
 “ to a foreign Monarch, but for *supremacy of divine*
 “ *right.* They supposed they were called upon by
 “ the Government of England to renounce this *ar-*
 “ *ticle of their faith*, when Elizabeth declared herself
 “ Head of the Church, &c.. You should hold them
 “ to have *denied the faith*, if they had acceded to the
 “ Oath of Supremacy, so worded, and so proposed.
 “ They acted *heroically* in resisting principles, which
 “ the Government of the day attempted to ram down
 “ their throats with Mahomedan violence; and they
 “ would not have deserved the name of Irishmen,
 “ or of Christians, much less of martyrs, if in reli-
 “ gious matters, they had been governed by any other
 “ principles,

* 1 Col. 87.

† Ib. 90.

“principles, than those of that heavenly *persuasion*,
“which characterizes the Gospel of Jesus Christ.”

In

* I again arrest my reader's attention to this passage, which Dr. Charles O'Connor refers to in his last work (5 Col. 283) as being an *unequivocal declaration*, that he does *not recommend to his countrymen to take the Oath of Supremacy*. Throughout the whole of it, he certainly commends the sincerity of his ancestors, who heroically resisted principles, which government attempted to ram down their throats with Mahomedan violence. But in no part of this passage does he express his own adoption of the belief of his ancestors: on the contrary, he says, *whether they were right or wrong in this supposition, is another question*. (1 Col. 90). Confident I am, that whoever has noticed the shuffling prevarication, with which the *cydevant soi disant Columbanus* has attempted to substitute the oath of allegiance proposed by James, (which we have all *equivalently* taken, by swearing to an oath of exactly the same tendency) for the oath of supremacy, and to *ram down* his readers throats with *Arian* duplicity and effrontery, this unwarranted denial, will know how to appreciate his charge of *deliberate falsehood and dishonesty, and utter insensibility of the sacredness of truth*, against Doctor Milner. They will be at no loss to discover to whom, apply most forcibly, the words of Doctor O'Connor, (5 Col. 277). “I detest falsehood in every shape it assumes: in history particularly, every deviation from truth, however apparently venial, ought to be prosecuted with all the severity of literary censure; the utmost indignation of science is too mild a punishment for *intentional* misrepresentation. Perhaps there is no human propensity, no brutal passion, against which Christianity has opposed such barriers, as against misrepresentation.” (5 Col. 109). Elizabeth's Oath of Supremacy! James's apology for his own Oath of Allegiance! Peter Walsh! Masson! Rev. Doctor Charles O'Connor!!!

In assuming, that “ the title *Head of the Church*,
 “ though odious to a Catholic, means no more than
 “ *Temporal Head of the Church, and Defender of the*
 “ *Faith*, you ascribe to the whole English nation the
 “ disgraceful barbarism of your own confined ideas.
 Few Englishmen annex the import to the term *De-*
fender of the Faith, which you may, who so well know,
 that it was conferred by a Pope upou Henry VIII. for
 having written against Luther, who denied his Holi-
 ness’s supremacy of jurisdiction, as you also do. But
 a serious reference to the *temporal power* of
 a Pope, (*qua* Pope) is setting up a chimera in chris-
 tian theology, which would have disgraced the
 extreme pruriency of the most bigotted ultro-monta-
 nist. Yet you very consistently and coolly inform
 us, that “ no Englishman ever yet for a moment
 “ supposed, that the King could administer Sacra-
 “ ments, ordain Priests, give a mission† for preaching
 “ or

* It becomes wearisome, to be constantly stringing fresh
 bead-rolls of Columbanus’s incongruities, contradictions, and
 falshoods. (1 Col. 105.) “ Spiritual mission must be *independ-*
 “ *ent of the civil power.*” (1 Col. 91) “ No Englishman ever
 “ supposed, that the King could give a mission for preaching
 “ or teaching, or be the source of *spiritual*, as well as of tempo-
 “ ral power.” (3 Col. 69.) “ It is not enough to be ordained,
 “ unless the person so ordained have also a *mission from the*
 “ *Church.*” (4 Col. 90.) “ Spiritual mission must be *independ-*
 “ *ent of the State.*” (1 Col. 105) “ Thus, without a mission
 “ from the Church, there can be *no ecclesiastical jurisdiction*, no

“or teaching, or be the source of spiritual, as well as
 “of temporal power.” Before I proceed, deign most
 learned

“no valid administration of sacraments.” (1 Col. 103) “For
 “this he must await the mission of the Church, which is to in-
 “dicate to him his particular destination, whether to Ireland,
 “to England, or to America, &c. *Quomodo prædicabunt, nisi*
 “*mittantur?*” (4 Col. 39) “Bishops can no more give juris-
 “diction beyond the limits of their own dioceses, than priests
 “can beyond the limits of their own parishes. — All require a
 “regular mission, which is limited by the Church: and may
 “in some cases be limited by the state. Spiritual jurisdiction
 “is not like a lump of matter, which can be divided into bits
 “and scraps.” (1 Col. 14) “I feel the necessity of recur-
 “ring to the *Protection of Law.*” (1 Col. 24) “Is the re-
 “sponsibility of *Law* never to be known in that Church?” (2
 Col. 162) “Such proposals (viz. of a Veto) tend to obstruct
 “foreign influence, and reduce undue exercise and abuse of
 “episcopal power under *legal restraint.*” (4 Col. 46) “The
 “Castabala principles are hostile to the safety of our religion,
 “which cannot exist or keep pace with the rapid increase of
 “our population, unless it is supported by that canonical dis-
 “cipline, without which we may transmit a vile, intriguing,
 “ultramontane, but we cannot transmit a LEGAL NATIONAL
 “Church to posterity.” (4 Col. 41) “Jurisdiction only re-
 “quires the will of the superior.” (4 Col. 90) “Does it fol-
 “low, because the civil power cannot ordain a Priest, that
 “therefore it cannot nominate a Priest to attend the convicts
 “at Newgate, or the sick and wounded in a hospital, or in a
 “camp, or in the field of battle? The spiritual qualifications
 “of *ordination* and *mission*, must be independent of the
 “state; but those qualifications are not, in the present state
 “of Ireland, sufficient without some degree of *temporal power.*”

learned and Reverend Doctor, to inform the ignorant dabblers in history, if the *King cannot give*
Mission

(2 Col. 125) “Fortunately there are English Statesmen,
 “ friends to Ireland, and to the national liberties of mankind,
 “ who without touching a single article of our faith, will en-
 “ deavour to hold the *Ægis of the Law* between the abuse of
 “ spiritual power and the liberties of the Irish people.”

If any determinate meaning can be collected from this mass of contrary and contradictory propositions, it appears to be an inordinate anxiety in the most learned Doctor to deprive the christian Primate of any power of suspension, renovation or controul over Bishops, and of Bishops over their parochial Clergy: at all events, that it can not be executed without the concurrence, judgment and sanction of the Civil Magistrate. It is irksome, perhaps not useless, to repeat, that the right is not to be exercised wantonly and arbitrarily; but with cause. Yet this cause is not of itself questionable before a civil tribunal: that is in explanatory terms, abstracting from any civil establishment, without which the Universal Church subsisted for the three first, and the Church of Ireland the three last centuries, the Christian Primate as Vicar of Christ on earth cannot be questioned, controuled, compelled, or punished for withdrawing, revoking, suspending, or annulling the Spiritual jurisdiction or mission, which he had by the act of institution or confirmation conferred upon a Bishop over a particular diocese. In like manner the Bishop's collation or derivative jurisdiction to the Priest over a particular parish within his diocese, or the subtraction, limitation, or suspension of it are not objects of civil jurisprudence. Wherever the state annexes or appropriates land, money, or any species of property, or civil benefit to the person possessing such mission or

Mission, as not being the source of Spiritual power,
 and if neither *election, confirmation, consent or know-*
 Y *ledge*

jurisdiction, the Pope or the Bishop would palpably exceed his power by judging or ordering any thing about such property, without the permission or concurrence of the civil magistrate. After the deprivation, or during the suspension of such mission, the civil rights, or legal property of the Bishop or Parish Priest remain precisely as they were before, unless or until the civil magistrate of the state, in which the property is situated, shall have expressed his will and directions about it. Thus very recently has happened a case in point; I will not call it a precedent. I consider it still pending; for I should be loath to suppose, that an appeal from this judgment, if so it can be called, should not be made. It tends powerfully to elucidate the operation and efficacy of spiritual power.

At the last Fermanagh Assizes, a traverse was taken by some Catholic prisoners confined in the gaol at Enniskillen, to the presentment of the Grand Jury for an interdicted Clergyman of the Catholic religion, whom they had under the XLVII Section. of the last Prison Act, passed on the 10th June, 1810, appointed to be Roman Catholic Chaplain of that goal. The person so appointed was not only a Catholic Priest, but also a regular Friar, and therefore besides the general submission to episcopal authority, which in church government every resident Priest owes to his diocesan Bishop, he also owed special obedience in virtue of his religious vow to the superior of his own order, called the provincial. This man by having received Priest's orders in the Roman Catholic Church, answered the description of person, whom the supreme civil magistrate empowered the court to appoint, viz. *a Priest or Clergyman of the Roman Catholic Church*. For some (doubtless valid) reasons both the Bishop and the provincial had laid this man under interdict, or prohi-

ledge of the Pope be requisite, and that our Bishops are *not of his Holiness' nomination*, from what source do

bited him from exercising his sacerdotal functions. He was in that state, of which Columbanus says: *thus without a mission from the Church, there can be no ecclesiastical jurisdiction, no valid administration of sacraments.* The Act entitles the Grand Jury to appoint annual salaries in country towns, from 30*l.* to 50*l.* to such Chaplains, as shall duly and regularly execute their duties. Mr. Baron M'Clelland, a right *Columbanian* Judge, charged the jury, and they found against the traverse. He was as anxious as Columbanus for the state *in some cases to limit the mission, and to make the responsibility of the law known in the Roman Catholic Church.* It will be admitted on all hands, that the Roman Catholic Bishop, or the Provincial, had no power whatever over the salary: but they could not abandon their trust or surrender their duty, by granting jurisdiction or faculties to the unfit or unworthy, or by not withdrawing them from those, who had abused them, and for this were they to render an account to God. This courtly Baron told the Jury, that *in law* the interdict of the Chaplain was an *arrogation and an assumption of power* by the person, who called himself *Bishop of that diocese.* He announced a serious admonition, that both he and the Provincial should be brought before a Court of Justice, to be punished for their *illegal arrogation and assumption of power.* For thereby they not only usurped a power above that of the Grand Jury, but of the Legislature itself; a power, which he hoped to God he never should see vested in them. He observed, that it was the opinion of Catholics, that a Parish Priest might prevent any other person from exercising spiritual jurisdiction, or sacerdotal functions, within his parish, without leave of the Bishop: a prison was of no parish, its inhabitants were generally of diverse and distant parishes. He admitted, with the Counsel for the traversers, that the Chaplain's duty

do their Catholic Bishops derive the mission or spiritual jurisdiction?

Y 2

It

to the Catholic prisoners should be performed according to the discipline of the Catholic Church ; and he most ineptly followed up that admission, with referring to the irrelevant testimony of the Protestant Chaplain, that the appointee of the Grand Jury had *discharged his clerical functions in the goal with perseverance, attention, and assiduity*. Spiritual mission is no visible external badge ; but without it, even Columbanus admits, there is no valid administration of Sacraments. It is *lucē clarius*, that this legislative provision for a Roman Catholic Chaplain, was made, in order, that the Roman Catholic prisoners might in their captivity, or before their execution, have the consolation and benefit of receiving the sacraments according to the rites of their own Church ; therefore when Mr. Baron M'Cleland, through ignorance, bigotry, or intolerance, so pointedly contravened the intention of the supreme civil magistrate, he was depriving his Catholic fellow-countrymen of that partial and conditional toleration, which they have enjoyed since the year 1793, and throwing the *power of the Keys*, which they hold (as Protestants also do) to be of divine institution, entirely under the controul of the civil magistrate. By such false doctrines, and the recommendation of a *Veto*, has the grand effort been attempted to *mundanize* the kingdom of Christ, by incorporating it with, and subjecting it to the state, in order to verify Columbanus's vaunting promises and predictions to his countrymen. (4 Col. 12.) “ With the blessing of God *the shade of the great Columbanus* shall not have appeared to us in vain. We shall yet have a NATIONAL CHURCH; our ancient renown shall not yet be annihilated.” This incident not only falsifies the assumption of the magistrate's power to give jurisdiction to a Chaplain to a camp, prison, or hospital (4 Col.

Columbanus' anti-
pathy to
Rome, sub-
sequent to
the canvas
for Elphin.

It is in evidence, that before the 2d of May 1810 one Catholic Arch-Bishop, Dr. Troy, one Catholic Bishop, Dr. Moylan, one Protestant English Nobleman the Marquis of Buckingham wrote several letters concerning your canvas for the See of Elphin, refusing or declining any interference or co-operation in advancing you to it. Had that canvas been successful, you Rev. Doctor, would probably ere this have been nominated or confirmed in that See by his Holiness Pope Pius the VII, as Dr. French and his predecessors had been by preceding Bishops of the See of Rome. Then Columbanus's letters might not have appeared, or the manuscript, or even printed sheets might like your grandfather's memoirs have been consigned to some other confluence of Lethe and Cocytus. Lest however the failure in the contest for Elphin, might by some be attributed to your want of powerful influence at the court of Rome, in the autumn of 1810, you assure your brother,* that you might have been "assisted in the object he had "so much at heart, by some of the first recommen- "dations, if you had chosen to have *accepted of them,* "and you might perhaps very safely, that is *without* "discovery

41) but discredits, either for truth, or relevancy, the following assertion, (5 Col. 6) "The Bishops are indeed so *generous*, as "to admit, that the state may have a negative, in the nomina- "tion of a Chaplain to administer sacraments to felons in "Newgate."

* 3 Col. 13.

“*discovery*, acquiesce in a bull obtained through Dr.
 “Walsh at Paris, or Cardinal *Maury*, at Rome.”
 “But had you so bartered your principles of religi-
 “ous discipline and allegiance, you ought to change
 “your name and deny your family, rather than that
 “*it should be known** that you disgraced the one, or
 “violated the hereditary honours and dignity, and
 “religion of the latter.” It was not untill the nega-
 tive, or apologetic letters from Doctor Troy, Doctor
 Moylan, and Lord Buckingham, and the circulars to
 the Clergy of the second order had (as we must pre-
 sume several other such steps unknown to us) failed
 in their object, that the Rev. and most learned Doc-
 tor published the following solemn protest against the
 lawfulness or validity of it. † “I do most distinctly
 “profess my full and deliberate conviction, that no
 “appointment to an Irish Bishoprick can be legiti-
 “mate

* There appears to me something rather singular in Colum-
 banus's boast of the ability to procure the See of Elphin, thro'
 French influence, without fear of *detection*, and then argue, that
 disgrace would have fallen upon himself and his family *should it be*
known. I consider, that the three unsuccessful applications to
 Bishops, not of the Province of Tuam, and a Nobleman not of
 the Catholic Church, to be an uncanonical abuse of *foreign in-*
fluence, as much as the application to Mr. Walsh and Cardinal
 Maury. The repeated offers boasted of by the most learned
 Doctor prove, at all events, the extent and duration of the can-
 vas for advancing him to the See of Elphin, to have been much
 more extensive, than is known to the public. But the French
 say proverbially. *Tout chemin mene a Rome*.

† 3 Col. 3.

“mate in the present state of Europe, without the
 “free election of the diocesan clergy, assembled in
 “chapter for that purpose, after the Bishop’s death,
 “*vacante sede.*” Henceforward under such *full and deliberate conviction*, your opposition and hostility to the powers and jurisdiction of the Supreme Pontiff were solemnly proclaimed, and urged in your Addresses to your countrymen, under the wilful, mischievous, and malicious misrepresentations of several historical facts, and gross misconceptions of law. On these grounds, I find it my duty to reply to them. Let others point out your theological errors.

Columba-
 nus’ impor-
 tant mis-
 representa-
 tions.

The important events, which you misrepresent to your countrymen with a view to your grand attack upon the chair of St. Peter, are the civil constitution of the French clergy, and the synodical resolutions of the Irish Bishops at Tullow on the 6th of June 1809, approving of the concordat entered into by Pope Pius the VII, with the ruling power of France. These you basely make the vehicle of your personal rancour and vindictive calumny against your opponent Bishop Milner, and your implacable and scandalous abuse and opposition to your own Hierarchy. History may be falsified, as well by suppression of truth, as by displaying untruth. It fell to my lot in writing the History of the *British Empire for the last 20 months** to have occasion to speak of the civil constitution

* Published in 1794, by Robinson, in London, and by P. Byrne in Dublin,

tution of the French clergy which threw that church into the schism, out of which that respectable portion of the flock of Christ was taken by the *Concordat* before mentioned. It now becomes requisite to shew, what were the effects of that civil magistrate's interference with *Church Government*, by erecting, as you so frequently and ardently wish, a *National Church* independent of the Papal supremacy. You will allow me to refer to what I said as an impartial and faithful historian (a character I never mean to forfeit) about eighteen years ago, because on re-perusing it, I find that your, and some other attempts to plunge Ireland into a similar schism, have added strength and incalculable importance to the truths contained in that passage.

After having (p. 104) stated, that the execution of the decree for banishing all the nonjuring clergymen to Guiana, who should not have quitted the kingdom in fourteen days from the passing of that decree, poured thousands of those venerable exiles from Normandy, Piccardy, and Britanny, upon our coasts of Kent and Sussex, I observed, that the naked plea of wretchedness, was a precept to British philanthropy, and it was but justice to that persecuted clergy to apprise their benefactors of the motives and necessity of their exile. I am free to say, that the same *motives and necessity* exist for the Irish rejecting the doctrines, and solicitations of you, Rev. Sir, and most learned Doctor, if they wish not to be plunged into a similar

French
Emigrant
Clergy.

lar

lar schism, pregnant perhaps with more dangerous consequences than that of France, by reason of the civil disunion, which would attend it.

Civil Constitution of the French Clergy.

“ The test proposed to them was an oath to submit to the *civil constitution of the clergy*. The nature and tendency of this oath has been grossly misconceived, and maliciously misrepresented by many, to the great prejudice of those, who have refused to subscribe to it. The *philosophizing* party in France, who had grounded their success in abolishing every idea of Christian revelation upon the previous destruction of all the respectable clergy, were too refined to unmask their designs, till the people were prepared for so daring an attempt. They knew, that religion could not long survive the destruction of *Church Government*; and therefore under the sanctimonious pretence of reducing it to its ancient form, they artfully transferred to the *civil* power, the whole *pure, spiritual jurisdiction*, which the Catholic church has uniformly through all ages maintained to be holden immediately of Christ, and to be transcendent to, and independent of all temporal authority. This self-created lay power of deposing, displacing, and suspending from all *spiritual* powers and faculties both the Bishops and the inferior Clergy, of curtailing and enlarging the limits of their *spiritual jurisdiction*, of abolishing the old and erecting new Bishopricks and parishes, of conferring by their election, the power and right of exercising the ministry of the gospel, of superceding

superseding the authority of the holy councils, and annulling the primacy of jurisdiction, which as Roman Catholics, they admitted in the Bishop of Rome. To subscribe then to the Oath of submission to this *civil constitution* of the *clergy*, was in effect to deny the *divine* establishment of a church upon earth: it was to allow, that the spiritual power and jurisdiction, which they had hitherto exercised over their flocks were usurped and invalid; it was to admit that a self-constituted lay tribunal could annihilate those powers, which it had not given, and absolve the flocks from their obedience to their lawful pastors; it was to subject the *divine* mission and ministry of the gospel to all the changes and fluctuations of temporal governments; it was to raise the intrigues, passions, and artifices of popular demagogues and tyrants above the authority of the œcumenical councils of the church: it was to substitute a profane and impious prostitution of their sacred characters to *lay* usurpers, in lieu of that submission to the supreme Bishop of Rome, by and through which (in the Roman Catholic tenets) they hold communion with the universal church of Christ upon earth. Such is the Oath, for the recusancy of which, the nonjuring clergy of France have been persecuted as refractory and rebellious: for which hundreds have been martyred in that kingdom, and for which thousands in this, and many other countries of Europe

Z.

rope

rope have emulated the constancy of the primitive Christians, in giving lustre and dignity to the sufferings they undergo for their faith. It will be well for the modern liberal deriders of fanaticism, and scoffers at Priestcraft to review impartially the horrid impieties, the blasphemous atrocities, with which the profane miscreants of France, since the expulsion of their conscientious clergy, seemed to have braved the vengeance of the Almighty. The crimes and offences of the abandoned flocks proclaim the glorious eulogies of their persecuted pastors."

Their civil
compliance
with the
State.

"In vain is this respectable clergy calumniated by their enemies, for having resisted the civil power and lawful constituted authorities of the State. It is notorious, that they had peaceably submitted to a reduction of their livings, little short of annihilation, that they offered their unequivocal submission to every change or alteration, which the authorities for the time being should chuse to make in the *civil establishment of their religion*, either by the abolition or subtraction of tithes and other temporal possessions, by the repeal or annulling of their *temporal* dignities and *civil* immunities, or otherwise, provided, they would leave untouched and inviolate that sacred deposit of faith, of which, with their *spiritual jurisdiction*, they had received the guardianship and trust, which they could only surrender into the hands, from which they had received

received them, and which they could not of themselves transfer nor abandon, but with their lives."

Such, Rev. and most learned Doctor, was the faithful statement of the case of the French emigrant clergy, which the lay historian or annalist felt himself called upon to transmit to posterity, with a particular view of preventing the followers of Peter Walsh (not in his truths but in his errors) the compilers of blue books, and such declaimers against an efficient primacy of dignity and jurisdiction in the successor of St. Peter as *Columbanus*, from misrepresenting their motives, and depriving them of the *palma martyrum*. I always traced in their oppugners and revilers, that sort of insidious antipathy against the chair of St. Peter, which notoriously prevailed in Quesnel,* and the Jansenistical party in France. They were the unrelenting labourers to establish a *national church*, and *self-elected* and *civilly* appointed Bishops in France, as at Utrecht they had done, by way of experiment: but had always failed, until the philosophizing leaders of the French revolution reduced to practice their Anti-Christian speculations, in the wicked establishment of the *civil constitution of the clergy*.

Jansenistical antipathy against the See of Rome.

Irishmen beware. Watch closely and with live jealousy your countryman, who has so long ago washed

Flagrant infidelity of Columbanus.

Z 2

“ off

* Doctor O'Connor openly boasts of his sympathies with him and other leaders of the Jansenists (who may not improperly

off the rouge of Irish prejudices. “* My good
 “ brother, says he nevertheless, I have a character
 “ yet

be termed the Puritans of the Roman Catholic Church, (4 Col.
 26, 7.) “ One of the vilest tricks of the *Court* theologians, and
 “ flatterers of the Pope’s *temporal dominion*, was to condemn in
 “ *globo*, as *smelling of heresy* and *offending pious ears*, all books,
 “ which are written against the abuses of their times. It was
 “ justly remarked of the bull against Quesnel’s works, that in
 “ reality it proposed not *one article to be believed*, and that the
 “ accumulated qualifications, of *heretical*, *ill-sounding*, *ill-*
 “ *smelling*, &c. which are applied to all his works, could not be
 “ applied to any one proposition in the whole. It was a par-
 “ ty bull, of which the celebrated Cardinal *Tencin*, and the pi-
 “ ous *Fitzjames*, Bishop of Soisson, and brother to our gallant
 “ countryman the Duke of Berwick, and that it proposed to
 “ be believed with implicit faith an indeterminate creed, of
 “ which not one article could be defined. And are those days
 “ of *undefined*, *technical*, theological words to be continued?”—
Irishmen beware! All that the self-opiniated Columbanus
 says, is neither to be believed nor admired. This Quesnel, to
 whom he so ostentatiously attempts to assimilate himself, spent
 his life chiefly in writing against the authority of his spiritual
 superiors; he early in life, A. D. 1684, quitted the congrega-
 tion of the Oratorians from refusing to sign a formula of the Ca-
 tholic faith, which expressly renounced Jansenism, of which he
 became the leader and head. One of the last of his many books
 namely, *Reflections Morales*, was publicly denounced as hereti-
 cal and seditious; they were condemned by Pope Clement XI.
 in 1708, suppressed by the Council in 1711, proscribed by
 Cardinal de Noailles in 1713, and finally solemnly anathema-
 tized by the bull or constitution *Unigenitus* published at Rome

“ yet to lose, notwithstanding all these imputations.
 “ I have never yet misquoted Gildas for the history
 “ of King Arthur, I have never perverted the words
 “ of any man, to answer my own purposes of ma-
 “ lignity or revenge. Wherever a passage is ob-
 “ scure, I explain it by the author's context,
 “ wherever it is clear, I give it's *plain, obvious and*
 “ *admitted*

on the 8th of September, 1713, accepted by the French Bish-
 ops assembled at Paris on the 25th of January 1714, enregist-
 tered in the Sorbonne on the 5th of March, and afterwards
 received by the episcopal body. The *pious Fitzjames*, was con-
 sidered by the Jansenists as the chief support of their party;
 some of his writings were condemned at Rome, and by several
 of the French Bishops. He was not *Brother*, but son of the
 gallant Duke of Berwick, and he was no countryman of Colum-
 banus; he was a natural son of James II. by Arabella Churchill,
 sister to the Duke of Marlborough, and he was born in 1671, at
 Moulins in France, as his mother was coming from drinking the
 waters of Bourbon. After so edifying and correct a piece of
 history, I again say, *Irishmen beware.* The bull *Unigenitus* is
 admitted by all Catholics to be a fair test or criterion, by which
 to discriminate the Jansenist from the Catholic. No orthodox
 Catholic will refuse, no real Jansenist will subscribe to it. You
 must therefore require some further authority, than the asser-
 tion of *Columbanus*, that Cardinal Tencin either thought or
 spoke of that bull in unison with the Bishop of Soisson. That
 Cardinal, when Arch-Bishop of Embrun, held that famous
 Council in 1727, against Soanen, the then Jansenistical Bishop
 of Senez, for which he was as warmly commended by the Ca-
 tholics, as he was execrated and traduced by the Jansenistical
 party.

“*admitted* meaning. I can not charge my consci-
 “ence with misrepresentation.” * “*I detest falsehood*
 “in every shape it assumes : in history particularly;
 “every deviation from truth, however apparently
 “venial, ought to be prosecuted with all the severity
 “of literary censure : the utmost indignation of
 “science is too mild a punishment for *intentional*
 “*misrepresentation.*”† No *new test acts*, such as that,
 “which has been framed in a *secret exclusive* synod
 “of Apostolic Vicars, who if this system is tolerated,
 “may introduce any profession of faith, they please,
 “and fetter every Catholic annalist, and every his-
 “torian by censures at will, and deprivation at
 “discretion, without any regard to the wisdom and
 “sanctity of 1800 years.” Now Rev. and most
 learned Doctor, I am a *Catholic annalist*, and will
 not let down my honorary degree of a *Doctor of Civil*
Law in the University of Oxford, by squeamishly
 disclaiming the character of an *historian*. I confi-
 dently claim that of a *true* one, maugre your pitiful
 taunts, at my being a *superficial and declamatory com-*
piler, a *plagiarist by the foot square*, a *vulgar and big-*
otted pamphleteer, a *vile calumniator*, a *malicious*
falsifier, a *coarse misrepresenter*, an *ignorant pretender*,
 a *scurrilous abuser of virtue and greatness*, an *inconsis-*
tent and superficial dreamer, a *dabbler in Irish History*,
 a *gaggler like other wild geese in one and the same note*,
 and

* 5 Col. 207. † 5 Col. 92.

and a copyist supplying you year after year with the same eternal sing song.

Stand forth thou mock patriot unrouged, thou whited wall, blazon all the disgusting wrinkles on thy front! Let thy countrymen there read those Bœotian falsehoods, with which thou hast unblushingly insulted them. “*I detest falsehood: and if I advance one word of untruth, I shall most gladly make amends by a public recantation. *Quasi tuba exalta vocem.* Be your recantation prompt, loud and full of the following flagrant historical untruths.” “†Four Vicars Apostolic English, assembled in synod have framed a new test, which implies personal infallibility on the part of the Pope, and they have imposed this yoke on the neck of the clergy, declaring, that they will not admit any to exercise the functions of his ministry, unless he subscribe three propositions, which no man can subscribe, unless he admit, as a foundation for his belief, the personal infallibility of Pope Pius VII.” You call it‡ “A new test act in favor of the Pope’s infallibility” You say § “it was framed in a secret exclusive synod, to which not one of the second order, the persons principally concerned, was admitted.” Your inveterate habit of misquoting and suppressing every thing, that imports respect and submission to the Christian primate prevents me from giving you credit for

Gross misrepresentation of the Synod of the English Vicars Apostolic.

* 2 Col. 216. † 5 Col. 51. ‡ 5 Col. 36. § 5 Col. 92.

for accuracy in quoting a letter written, by the Bishop of Castbala to a French Priest from Wolverhampton on the 6th of September 1811, in which you say, you find the following passage. “*It was agreed
 “ upon by all the four English Bishops in synod, in
 “ February last, that Priests receiving faculties in
 “ future should declare their assent to the following
 “ propositions. 1°. That they hold communion
 “ with his Holiness Pius VII. 2°. That they do not
 “ beleive the said Pope to have fallen into heresy or
 “ schism. 3°. That they do not consider him, as being
 “ the author or approver of any heresy or schism.”
 Here upon a recent and an important historical fact, that has taken place within those two years, is there more falsehood asserted by a man, who *detests falsehoods*, than could have been hazarded by any other, than an abandoned and thorough-paced bravo. *Eum oportet esse bene & naviter impudentem.* By the genuine document, which fortunately for the sake of truth, and the edification of this part of the Church, was neither *entombed in the sepulchral library of Stowe*, nor immersed in the Poddle at Dublin; you stand self-convicted of as much falsehood and misrepresentation, as could well be engrafted upon the fact of a Synodical meeting having been holden in London in February, in which the growth of the schism of Blanchard was taken into consideration by the English

lish Vicars Apostolic. In the first place, the synodical resolution in question (or even the mutilated and disfigured representation of it, as you say you found it in Doctor Milner's Letter) contains not a word, that can be tortured into an implication of the doctrine of personal infallibility in the Pope; as you say, "Now I for one, do not believe in any such prerogative; and the Irish Bishops have sworn, that it is no part of their faith." In the next place, it was not in any sense whatever, what your most veracious and orthodox Reverence calls and inveighs against, as a *secret and exclusive Synod, into which not one of the second order of the Clergy was admitted*. That synod consisted of five persons of the episcopal order and *seven* of the second order. In the last place, it will be found by comparison of the three propositions, which you (*who never perverted the words of any man to answer your own purposes of malignity and revenge*) have holden out to your countrymen, as the test or condition for the Vicars Apostolic granting faculties, or giving spiritual jurisdiction to their Priests, with the original, that you have *de facto*, (whether designedly or no, further detections of such suppressions and garblings will enable us to judge) omitted in the first proposition the following very important words, *as head of the Church of Christ, and legitimate successor of St. Peter*. The second original proposition you have unfaithfully and unfairly split into two, and the

2 A

third

third you have wholly suppressed ; and I must be free to say, that I cannot by any means lay such suppression to the account of Doctor Milner, who assisted at the synod, and wrote a letter to a French Priest about it, when a very serious question of difference in church government arose between the Vicars Apostolic and several of the French emigrant clergy, upon the subject matter of that *very* third proposition : namely, whether all the rights, duties, and relations of spiritual jurisdiction, and of spiritual superiors, and subjects did not attend those fugitive Prelates and their clergy into exile, so as to exempt them from the spiritual jurisdiction and authority of the ordinaries of the districts, in which they should reside. This third proposition was evidently resolved upon to set that question at rest, and to assert the spiritual jurisdiction and authority of the ordinaries over every person actually residing within their respective districts. The following is a faithful copy of the unanimous resolution of that Synod, in which the case of *Blanchard*, and others of the Emigrant French Clergy were taken into consideration.

Synodical
resolution
of the Vi-
cars Apos-
tolic.

“ Present, R. R. Dr. Gibson, V. A. for R. R. Dr.
“ Douglass, V. A. Rt. Rev. Dr. Poynter, Coadjr. R.
“ R. Dr. Milner, V. A. Rt. Rev. Dr. Collingridge,
“ V. A. Rev. Dr. Smith, Coadjr. Elect. R. J. Hodson,
“ V. G. Rev. T. Rigby, D. D. Rev. W. Fryer, R.
“ C. Macdonnell, R. J. Bramston, R. G. Chamber-
“ lain, Rev. John Griffith, Sec.” N. 23, Feby. 24.

“ Question.

“ Question. What adherence to Blanchard or his
 “ system should be judged a disqualification in a
 “ Priest to his being employed by a Bishop? Previ-
 “ ous to the answer, the Right Rev. Doctor Poynter
 “ suggested, that a Priest adhering to Blanchard, or
 “ his system, should be required to acknowledge, 1st.
 “ Pope Pius VII. as head of the church of Christ
 “ and legitimate successor of St. Peter. 2dly. That
 “ Pope Pius VII. is neither a heretic nor a schisma-
 “ tic, nor the author, nor the abettor of heresy or
 “ schism. 3dly. That no person has jurisdiction
 “ in the respective districts of the R. R. V. V. A. in
 “ England, except by delegation from them, or im-
 “ mediately from the Holy See?” *Answer.* “ Those
 “ who refuse to acknowledge the above articles are
 “ to be forbidden to exercise any ecclesiastical func-
 “ tions, and to say mass within their respective dis-
 “ tricts.” This misrepresentation of the Vicarial
 Synod in England, and the falsification of its resolu-
 tions are far from being single instances of the *cy-*
devant soi disant Columbanus’s aberrations from his-
 torical veracity, Christian candor, and theological
 accuracy.

* “ The Irish Bishops assembled at TuHow June 6, 1809, have thought it expedient to declare, that,
 “ though they hold the *Civil Constitution* of the French
 “ Clergy to be impious, heretical, schismatical, and

Misrepre-
 sentation of
 the Catho-
 lic Nation-
 al Synod of
 Tullow.

2 A 2

“ on

* 2 Col. 214.

“ on the whole to be rejected,” (a pretty climax!)
 “ yet the holy father Pius VII. has only yielded by
 “ the Concordat, what the dreadful exigencies of the
 “ times demanded from a true shepherd of the Chris-
 “ tian flock; and that in his measure for the resto-
 “ ration of Catholic unity in France,” (by crowning
 Bonaparte, &c. &c.) “ he has *validly, and agreeably*
 “ *to the use and spirit of the sacred Canons* exerted
 “ the powers belonging to the Apostolic See.” *

Irishmen, again I say, beware. Again I say, *Hunc tu Romane Caveto*. You naturally imagine, that these lines with inverted commas, are quotation from the synodical resolutions of the Bishops convened at Tullow, June 6, 1809. You would little suspect, that a Rev. and most learned Priest, who boasts of never having misquoted old Gildas, who wrote 1200 years ago, would not be faithful and correct in quoting the synodical printed resolutions passed by the Bishops of his own country within the last three years; nay, even actually pending the unsuccessful canvas for his promotion to the See of Elphin, (his own Prelate, the late Doctor French, assisting at, and signing them). † The misquotation is the least part of the deception,

* “ See,” says Columbanus, “ this very classical, elegant, and orthodox performance of the Holy Synod of Tullow, published by the Bishop of Castabala in his Supplement to a PASTORAL LETTER.” London, 1809. p. 17.

† “ A year has elapsed since you first wrote to me to assist your endeavours for my promotion to that See, &c.” 3 Col. 1.”

deception, which was intended to be practiced on your countrymen, to whom your letters are addressed, or rather for whose seduction into schism and disunion, they were written. The words of the 2d Resolution of that Synod, as they are reported by Bishop Milner in his supplement, from which you most learned Doctor pretended or affected to quote them, are:

“ We declare, that adhering as we have done from
 “ the beginning to the decisions of Pius VI. of holy
 “ remembrance, concerning the so-called *Civil Con-*
 “ *stitution of the Clergy of France*, and judging, after
 “ those decisions, that the said Constitution was im-
 “ pious in its suggestions, heretical in its pretensions,
 “ schismatical in several of its provisions, and on the
 “ whole to be rejected; we judge at the same time,
 “ that our holy father Pius VII. has not meant to ap-
 “ prove, and by no color or inference, has he ap-
 “ proved of the errors, heresies, or impious princi-
 “ ples contained in the said *Civil Constitution of the*
 “ *Clergy*, or of any of them; but that especially in
 “ his measure of the restoration of Catholic unity,
 “ and the peaceful exercise of true religion in France,
 “ he has adhered to that, which was dogmatical in
 “ the said decisions of his predecessor, and that he
 “ has only yielded what the dreadful exigencies of the
 “ times demanded from a true shepherd of the Ca-
 “ tholic flocks, in commiseration of *such days, as ne-*
 “ *ver appeared from the beginning of the world, and if*
 “ *they had not been shortened on account of the elect, all*
 “ *flesh would not have been saved.*” “ Thirdly,

“ Thirdly, we declare, that in the Pontifical Acts
 “ already mentioned of Pius VII. he has validly, and
 “ agreeably to the spirit of the sacred Canons exert-
 “ ed the powers belonging to the Apostolical See :
 “ that he has effectually restored the Catholic Chris-
 “ tians of France to the visible body of the Church :
 “ and that he has thereby imparted to them a true
 “ communion with the universal Church, that being
 “ restored to God, through Christ, they may have
 “ remission of their sins in the holy spirit : and we
 “ accept, approve, and concur with the said Acts of
 “ Pius VII. as good, rightful, authentic, and neces-
 “ sary, inspired by charity, and done in the faith of
 “ his predecessor.” *

Further
 misrep-
 resentations
 by Colum-
 banus.

Laying aside all Irish, as well as English prejudices, you will allow me, Rev. Sir, to bid defiance to every individual female or male, Catholic or acatholic, from Stowe to Castlereagh, to read separately the text and your pretended quotation of it, without having different, widely different, conceptions, and impressions, and without drawing opposite conclusions. *Irishmen beware!* Recollect who says,† “ Give me
 “ *Irish honesty*, and I will start with it against all the
 “ the *fine* virtues, of all the *fine* nations of the globe.”

Yes,

* The matchless effrontery, with which Columbanus misrepresents the Synodical Acts of Tullow, throws me under the necessity of presenting my readers with full evidence of this serious charge. He will find the whole in the App. No. V.

† 4 Col. 26.

Ye, who are his countrymen, give him largely of your exuberance, and back him confidently against the field. Watch every step from the starting to the winning post. "Those Bishops, say you,* were not pressed by any legitimate authority to pronounce any opinion on the subject: but they would shew the public, that they can decide *all matters* appertaining to faith and discipline *exclusively*; and so they passed a Synodical Decree in favor of the *Concordat*, against *Abbe Blanchard*, with whose writings in favour of the Bourbons, they would have done wisely not to interfere! But the more limited is the society, in which we live, the more contracted and absurd are our ideas. A petty Constable is a great man in a village; so is Mr. Lyon's Village Lawyer; and so is a Politician Bishop in a Synod of Tullow. The whole world is nothing in the eye of the Statesman of a Cabbage Garden!" The falsehood, deception, and malice of the first part of this quotation will be presently disclosed. The tapinosis, † with which it so loftily concludes, I leave in the cabbage garden, where compost has its use.

I have observed, that these democratic evangelizing agitators, "† these *boutfeus* use all their arts of

"fascination

Base attempt to fix all the Catholic Clergy of Ireland with perjury.

* 2 Col. 215.

† As some of my readers, may not, like the most learned Doctor, have gone through a regular course of rhetoric, for their benefit I remark, that this oratorical figure is so called from the Greek word *tapeinns*, humble low, &c.

‡ 1 Col. 73.

“fascination by loudly descanting upon some favo-
 “rite popular uncontroverted topic or point of ne-
 “cessary faith or discipline with zeal and enthusiasm;
 “that they may by insensible gradation lead their
 “followers from truism to doubt, obscurity and er-
 “ror.” The point used by you, Rev. Sir, for this
 lamentable purpose, is the negation and renunciation
 of any direct or indirect *temporal* power in the Bishop
 of Rome. You well know, that the Catholic Clergy-
 men both of the 1st. and 2d. order in Ireland have
 specifically and explicitly renounced it*; for in
 1810, that is, since your open proclamation of war
 with the Holy See, which is coeval with your consci-
 ousness of the failure of the canvas for Elphin, you
 have theologically discovered, † “a spiritual phrase-
 “ology, which is much worse than nugatory. It is a
 “profligate trifling in matters of the greatest impor-
 “tance; it is a species of equivocating profanation.”
 You then labour most indecently, as well as stupid-
 ly and maliciously, to fix every man, who has taken
 that oath with direct perjury, if he hold, that the
 Irish Bishops have been (perhaps your Reverence

meant

* Columbanus admits it in the following terms, (2 Col.38.)

“Do we not well know, that these very *Oaths of Allegiance*, for
 “which our ancestors were excommunicated by the Exclusive
 “Doctors of Waterford, in 1645, are the principles and oaths,
 “which are *now* taken by every Catholic Nobleman and
 “Gentleman, by every Bishop, and by every Priest,
 “from Kerry to Derry, from Cork to Donegal.”

† 2 Col. 119.

meant also, that they ought to be) appointed by foreign power.* “I should be glad to know, whether he, who swears, that he rejects all foreign *temporal* power, both direct and *indirect* on the part of the Pope, and yet not only allows his interference in the patronage of every diocese in Ireland, but also applies to him for nomination to every Bishoprick worth from 200l. to 700l. *per annum*, is not guilty of a violation of that oath?” You continue your scandalous and malignant sophistry, by endeavouring to debauch your countrymen into a belief, that it is sinful to “take such an oath, as long as any *foreign temporal influence*, any foreign patronage, and foreign nomination to vacant Sees is allowed? for are not all those things *temporalities*, and *temporalities* too of very considerable importance? and is not the appointment to them *direct power*? Nay is it not *exclusive*? Is it not *uncountrouled*?” With such wretched contumacious sophistry do you labour to fix your Hierarchy with the prevaricating baseness and inconsistency of condemning and rejecting by a solemn synodical decision, the very identical proposition, which each of them had individually sworn to. And this you endeavour to effect by the grossest deception upon those, who give you some credit for historical knowledge and fidelity.

21

“You

* 2 Col. 119, 120.

Misrepresentation
of Dr. Milner & the
Gallican declaration.

* “ You who well know (say you to your brother)
“ the principles, which I have ever professed, will
“ judge of my surprize, when instead of finding in
“ the conduct of our Bishops those facilities for the
“ emancipation of our country, which I had, untill
“ lately, expected from them, *I read* the following
“ paragraph in a pamphlet, written by their avowed
“ agent, the Bishop of an obscure village in Asia,
“ named *Castabala*, and published about the end of
“ last year. *There is not a single prelate in England*
“ *or Ireland, who is not firmly resolved to reject the*
“ *four articles of the Gallican Church (commonly called*
“ *the Gallican liberties).* *We are very far from find-*
“ *ing fault with the partizans of the articles, but we*
“ *think we see in these articles the germ of all the*
“ *present mischief: and to be brief, we are determined*
“ *not to subscribe to the articles.*” Here again the
misquotation, gross as it is, forms the last part of the
wicked and wilful misrepresentation and delusion
attempted to be practised upon your countrymen,
in order to plunge them into *spiritual* Schism and
civil dissention. If you Rev. and most learned
Doctor, thus expose your infidelity in quoting a co-
temporary work, that is in the hands of your friends
and foes, what credit dare you claim from any of
them for accuracy or fidelity, in quoting from authors
and documents lurking on the inaccessible shelves of
Stowe,

Stowe, of which you have the exclusive monopoly ; and which you boast, “ without the Noble Proprietor’s permission, you could not make use of in favour of any object, but that, for which it was collected ; for it has cost him more trouble and expence, than any other person ever yet incurred.” Now, I am free to admit, that his Lordship’s object in making (rather paying for) that collection, was *not* to compare and verify the false translations, the misquotations, and the irrelevant references of his Bibliothecarian. The misquotation of this latter passage, pretended to be cited *verbatim* (inverted commas denote literal repetition or quotation) from the *Bishop of Castabala’s Supplement to a Pastoral Letter, &c. London, 1809, p. 39.*” will appear to each of your countrymen, who with better right than *Columbanus*, lays claim to *Irish honesty*. The text alluded to, and supposed, or affected to be quoted, stands as follows, “ The said *Ex curè* continues to insist in the strongest terms, on revolutionizing our English theology, no less than our Church Government, by obliging us to adopt the four French articles, though there is not a single Prelate in England or Ireland, who is not firmly resolved to the contrary. We are very far from finding fault with the partizans of the articles : still we think, we see in these articles, the germ of all the present mischief ; and to be brief, we are determined neither to have *Blanchard* for our *Theological*, nor to subscribe to the articles.”

Detection
of Colum-
banus's ma-
lice & mis-
chief in
misquoting.

Before I undertake, Rev. and most learned Doctor, to expound the full malice and mischief of this misquotation, I crave leave to assure your Reverence, and all the readers of this letter to you, that for some days it completely misled my judgment, who had notwithstanding more reasons than most men for mistrusting you, and many for respecting the learned Prelate, from whom you pretended to quote. However I might suspect you of misquoting Gildas, which is a work in very few hands, or your Grandfather's Committee Papers, to which I could have *no* access, I did not imagine you hardy enough to misquote the alleged misquoter of Gildas, which was in every body's hands. *Sed qui semel verecundiæ fines transierit, eum bene et naviter oportet esse impudentem.** But he, who has once transgressed the boundaries of common decency, ought consistently to become thoroughly and systematically audacious. I was fully sensible of your keen scent in running down your antagonist; but little could I reconcile it with the knowledge, experience and zeal of that antagonist,† to give you such

* 12 Epist. Fam. Cic. L. V.

† I can justly attribute to him the qualities Columbanus ascribes to some of his clerical countrymen, (2 Col. 164.) *Patriarum Antiquitatum Indagator diligentissimus; Ecclesiasticæ libertatis defensor, Theologus profundus, Acerrimus vitiorum reprehensor, &c.*
 “ A most diligent enquirer into the antiquities of his country.
 “ A defender of Ecclesiastical liberty. A profound theolo-
 “ gian. A most keen lasher of Vice, &c.”

such a hold of him, as you would have had, could you have verified your quotation. I could not carry my mistrust in your fidelity to that extent, to which you have carried your assurance in misquoting what was open to all, and liable to immediate detection. You must, Rev. Doctor, have aspired only to the momentary sympathies and triumph of your admiring readers, or at most to an ephemeral victory, until a fair and impartial judge could procure the Bishop's Supplement to his Pastoral Letter, to compare with Columbanus's Third Letter on the Liberties of the Irish Church. I will own, that for some days I suffered an unusual and very perplexing humiliation, little short of indignation, from a belief (arising out of your misquotation) that Bishop Milner had abused his commission of agency to the Irish Prelates at the seat of Government in England, by identifying himself with their national Synod, in reprobating and rejecting the four articles of the Gallican Church, which I well knew many of that respectable Hierarchy had learnt, supported, or taught on the Continent; and volunteering as their mouth-piece, a public condemnation of those articles, as if they were mischievous, false, or erroneous. These impressions were distressing to me in proportion to my own opinion upon that declaration of the Gallican Clergy.*

I was

* That opinion is to be seen in my Church and State, from p. 591 to 618. I have revised it since reading Columbanus's Letters, and find nothing in it, which I wish to alter,

I was more especially confounded at the words *rejection of the four Articles of the Gallican Church*, because the first of those four articles, which is the only one interesting to the State, is the precise proposition or tenet (*the abrogation of any temporal power in the Pope over this realm*), which each of the Irish Hierarchy, each functionary Irish Priest, Doctor Milner, and I myself had sworn to, as the required test of loyalty and submission to the existing Government.

Retort up-
on Colum-
baeus.

The public, Rev. and most learned Doctor, have your *dictum*: *I cannot charge my conscience with misrepresentation*. They have also your assertion, that “the Bishops convened in Synod at Tullow, June 6, 1809, were not pressed by any legitimate authority to pronounce any opinion on the subject; but they would shew the public, that they can decide on all matters appertaining to faith and discipline *exclusively*.” I wish, Rev. Doctor, that I could apply to you what you say of the truly great Bossuet,* “the correctness of his quotations gives the best security to his readers against mistatements of the documents, to which he refers.” But I am amply justified in retorting your own words upon yourself, † that it is evident from *your* quotations, that you have read all Bishop Milner’s late works concerning the *Veto* with minute attention: and had you discovered in them any propositions (I must allow you pretend to

* 3 Col. 5.

† Dr. Milner’s Appeal, p. 15.

to have discovered some few) repugnant to Catholic faith, you had no reason to think, that from any tenderness to him, you would have covered the failings of an erring brother; for he, who can make good any charge by the *evidence of truth*, will hardly recur to *slandorous imputations*, which you yourself knew to be unfounded. Now, this is not only a *calumny*, but you, who have read all Bishop Milner's late works with such malignant diligence, must know it to be such. How then stands the fact?

Your Reverence knows as well, as every one does, who has at all turned his mind to this subject, that the commission of Bishop Milner's agency from the Irish Hierarchy, rests upon a Synodical resolution, or rather a ryder to their resolution of thanks to that respectable Prelate for his powerful and unwearied exertions in promoting the Catholic cause, passed in Dublin on the 15th September, 1808. His accredited powers are limited by these very guarded words "Resolved unanimously, that the Right Rev. Doctor Milner be requested to act as Agent to the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland, *at the Seat of Government*, agreeable to such instructions, as he may occasionally receive from the Archbishops in concurrence with their suffragans." From this it is evident, that whatever Doctor Milner says upon a subject, which has no reference to, or dependence upon the English Government, could not have been said by

Nature of
Bishop
Milner's
Agency
from the
Irish Ca-
tholic Hi-
erarchy.

by him in character of Agent to the Irish Clergy? Can you, Rev. Doctor, expect many proselytes to your idea, that because Doctor Milner is the accredited agent of the Irish Clergy at the Seat of the English Government, according to such instructions as he shall from time to time receive from the Archbishops and Suffragans, they are in any manner responsible for what he may write, either as a Divine, historian, antiquary, or Catholic Prelate. The learned and Christian world owes much to the talents, knowledge, and industry of that respectable Prelate for several publications. For none, more than for that Pastoral Letter and Supplement, to which you have so insidiously and maliciously referred, and so malignantly misquoted.

Occasion
of B. Mil-
ner's Pas-
toral Let-
ter and
Supple-
ment to his
own flock.

Invested by the Sovereign Pontiff with episcopal jurisdiction and the spiritual guidance and superintendence of the Roman Catholics residing in the midland district in England, Dr. Milner found himself called upon by his pastoral duty, to warn and guard his flock against the propagation within his district of certain heterodox, schismatical, and mischievous doctrines by two French emigrant Priests. They are contained in pamphlets, and tend directly to withdraw the English Roman Catholics from the center of Catholic unity, to undermine the canonical jurisdiction of their Prelates and Priests, and to plunge the British Catholics into schism, from which evil they

they have been free for nearly three centuries.* Since I have read your five letters or addresses, I am little surprized, though greatly shocked at your Reverence's making common cause with those turbulent tempters of the English Catholics to plunge themselves into so senseless and scandalous a schism. I avoid wading through the numerous errors, falsities, and indecencies, published by these two *foreign influence men*. Their names are *Gaschet* and *Blanchard*; and a part of their doctrines† is, that the Pope is the author of the heresy and schism, in which the Gallican Church is, according to them, at present involved, and that his Holiness Pius VII. ought to be denounced by the Catholic Church, without however specifying, whether as a heretic, or schismatic, or only for having violated the sacred canons. *Blanchard* endeavours to avoid exposing himself to direct censure, by not explicitly drawing the last consequence. *I have not said, Pius VII. is a heretic and a schismatic, and I have refused to say on the other hand, Pius VII.*

2 C

is

* Vide Sup. 3. and throughout.

† P. 60. L'heresie vient d'obtenir en France un triomphe complet, & Pie VII. en est la premiere & principale cause. p. 109. Un des sujets de leur justes plaintes (des eveques de France) cest, que Pie VII. par sa foiblesse, ait introduit le schisme meme, & l'heresie dans le sein de l'Eglise. p. 134. Quant a ce Pape (Pie VII.) Je dis seulement, qu'il faut le denoncer a l'Eglise Catholique, encore sans specifier, si c'est comme heretique & schismatique, ou uniquement pour avoir violé les regles saintes.

is not a heretic and a schismatic. Gaschet speaks more overtly than his brother soldier, in this determined warfare against the chair of Peter,* “Blanchard
 “would have rendered an important service to reli-
 “gion and to *politics*, if he would have affirmed that
 “in public, concerning the Pope’s schism and here-
 “sy, which he maintains in private company, &c. I
 “have the greater reason to be acquainted with the
 “real sentiments of Mr. Blanchard, because two
 “years ago he advised me to denounce Pius VII. to
 “all the Bishops of the universe, as a schismatic and
 “the abettor of heresy and apostacy, and to declare,
 “that I should take their silence as a proof of their
 “assent to my denunciation.” No sincere orthodox member of the Roman Catholic communion can sympathize and co-operate with these wolves, who have carried destruction into the folds committed separately and distinctly to their respective Bishops, and supereminently to the supreme Pastor of them all collectively; he cannot concur in denouncing his Holiness guilty of heresy and schism, for having brought back into the fold several millions of strayed sheep; he will not only commune with, but he will submit to, and venerate, and thank his Prelate, whoever he is, that instructs, warns, and defends his flock from so much dissention, scandal, error, and falshehood. To the disappointed candidate for Elphin an attack upon the Pope was the warhoop for blood and carnage. You instantly armed and rushed
 into

* Declar. 61, 62.

into the thickest of the battle, to encounter, hand to hand, the complete Hierarchy of your own country with your particular enemy *Castabalensis*, all fighting the battle of the Christian Primate against those seducers, dispersers, and devourers of his flocks.

It is painful to the writer and irksome to the reader, but necessary for the elucidation of the subject, that your Reverence be holden up to the Protestant as well as Catholic public, as contravening and contradicting with incredible effrontery your own assertions. *I have never perverted the words of any man to answer my own purposes of malignity, or revenge. I cannot charge my conscience with misrepresentation, although it be notorious, that the declaration or resolutions of the Synod at Tullow, contain not a word relating to the four Gallican propositions, directly or indirectly. In the false quotation, which I have before noticed, you put into Doctor Milner's mouth these words: There is not a single Prelate in England or Ireland, who is not firmly resolved to reject the four Articles of the Gallican Church. Now a firm resolution to reject negatives actual rejection: it certainly is not a statement, that they had been rejected unanimously, as you falsely charge Doctor Milner with having made** Still less warranted were you, Rev. and most learned Doctor, in asserting, † that “*Castabala* in 1810 dares to inform us, that he and the

Further
proofs of
the gross
infidelity
of Colum-
banus.

2 C 2

exclusive

* 3 Col. 5.

† 2 Col. 11.

“*exclusive Doctors, the foreign influenced Bishops of*
 “*Ireland have decreed, that Ireland shall not enjoy the*
 “*liberties of the Gallican Church.*” And again you
 misrepresent the case to your countrymen, by affect-
 ing to tell them (so long after you had boasted of
 having washed off the rouge), * “I am far from
 “despising popular opinions; and it would ill be-
 “come me to treat with disrespect those of my own
 “country. But breathes there an Irishman, pos-
 “sessed of an Irish heart, who can help feeling in-
 “dignant, when he sees *the liberties of the Gallican*
 “*Church denied to Ireland by her own Bishops?*”† And
 “our Bishops might then claim a power not only of
 “denying us the *Gallican liberties*, as they have alrea-
 “dy ventured to do, &c.” Least of all were you jus-
 tified in giving the following title to the first number‡
 of your appendix, which consists of a mutilated, false,
 and unfaithful translation of those four articles, and
 some very unwarrantable inferences of your own, in
 notes. *The four Articles of the Gallican Church re-*
jected by the Bishops of Ireland: or the following title,
 or head of reference in the contents to your third
 letter, viz. “*Gallican liberties unjustly and unwisely*
 “*rejected by the Bishops of Ireland.*” Do not these
 titles falsely announce an actual and formal rejection
 of those four propositions or articles by some public
 or solemn act of the whole body of the Irish Hier-
 archy?

* 2 Col. 2.

† 3 Col. 27.

‡ 3 Col. 125.

archy? What excess of credulity could convince any man in the possession of sane intellects, (*Credat Judæus Apella non ego*,) that your Reverence, after having so fastidiously boasted of the truth, and your adoption of the articles, which are thus stated to be “rejected unanimously by our Bishops, I hold to be true, and their opposites I hold not only to be false, but also to be connected with a system of uncanonical and uncontrouled dominion of wordly pride and usurpation, which if introduced, would gradually establish *in the name of the Lamb of God* a new and insupportable yoke on the necks of my Catholic countrymen,” that I say you, Rev. Sir and most learned Doctor, who vaunt that * “wherever a passage is obscure, I explain it by the author’s context, wherever it is clear, I give its *plain, obvious, and admitted meaning*,” should have palmed upon your readers and the public so unfaithful, so mutilated, so garbled, so astutely disfigured a version transcript or copy of those very propositions, which you affect to lay before your readers, in an Appendix, as *the four Articles of the Gallican Church rejected by the Bishops of Ireland*.†

I am

* 3 Col. 74.

† As his Reverence has warned his countrymen against too easy credulity in the words of Horace *quodcunque ostendis mihi sic, incredulus odi*: I shall borrow from the same source an apology for giving the original, with a fair and literal translation, in order that the reader may compare them with the

Infallibili-
ty and in-
defectibili-
ty of the
Church.

I am not fond, most learned Doctor, of being drawn off by a fresh scent, before I have completely run down the game I originally started. It may, however

translation of *Columbanus*. Nothing short of ocular demonstration will convince him of the gross and evil minded infidelity and distortion, that upon comparison of the different readings must be glaring*.

* Segnius irritant animos demissa per aures
Quam quæ sunt oculis subjecta fidelibus.

What we hear
With weaker passion will affect the heart,
Than when the faithful eye beholds the part.

Fra. Hor. Art of Poetry.

It is morally impossible, that any person, who has followed *Columbanus's* surmises, and insinuations, and assertions, and observations, and applications, and inferences concerning the Gallican propositions, not to lay his omission of every word in that declaration of the Gallican Clergy, tending to enforce and support reverence and obedience to the supreme dignity and jurisdiction of the Pope, or Vicar of Christ upon Earth, to a studied intent of representing the whole declaration as injurious, insulting, distrustful, and hostile to the chair of Peter. Whereas it was expressly made in support of the Spiritual Power emanating from Christ, through his Vicar on Earth, by marking strongly and unequivocally the line of demarcation between the power of the Civil Magistrate, and that of the Church Governor. In order to afford the reader a clear opportunity of remarking *Columbanus's* unprecedented and audacious lust for misrepresentation, the original declaration of the Gallican Clergy with a very close and literal translation of it into English will be found with his mangled and disfigured edition of it in the Appendix No. VI. It may also help to disperse some unfounded prejudices of

however be necessary for the information, instruction, and even consolation of some of my readers, to caution them against the obvious inference, which some credulous, unsuspicious, or superficial readers, may be seduced to draw from your very warm assertion of the truth of the Gallican propositions, and the grievous denunciations you fulminate against those, who differ from you upon their tendency. Neither may every one at first view clearly discriminate between the actual rejection, and the non-adoption of four several propositions. The first imports a censure, disapproval, or denial of the truth, or at least presumes some sort of objection to each of them. The latter is perfectly consistent with the submission even to the truth of each; and the non-adoption may be justified by objections to the wording of any one of them, to the liability of cavil or misconstruction, or even groundless scandal or prepossession; by well-founded surmize, that an ill use is intended to be made of, or would probably, or might possibly, follow the adoption; in a word, by any of that indefinite variety of chances, designs or results, which the factious,

tightly laced ultramontanists, that that declaration was originally made, and when rightly understood, most powerfully tends to support and uphold the efficient divine primacy of dignity and jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome. The seizure and application of those prejudices to his own schismatical purposes, is not the least insidious and mischievous part of this arch misrepresenter's conduct.

factionous, intriguing, and ambitious are ever on the watch to avail themselves of. You, Rev. Doctor, quote from your determined opponent, Dr. Milner, these words: *we are very far from finding fault with the partisans of the articles.* Proof, that he did not think them false and erroneous. Yet, when a factious foreign Priest applies to the Irish Bishops (tho' irregularly) by way of appeal, calling upon them to approve, and publish as a Sydonical Act their adoption of that declaration of the Gallican Clergy upon ecclesiastical power, for the manifest purpose of drawing them into his false reasonings, and thereby of entrapping them in some consequential sanction of the schismatical and heretical propositions, upon which he affected to appeal to them, with what prudence, propriety, or decency, could they yield to such a wish and intent? You full well knew, that in the oath, which you repeatedly say has been taken by the whole Irish Clergy, there is this specific declaration, *that it is not an article of the Catholic faith, neither am I thereby required to believe or profess, that the Pope is infallible.* As a simple layman I could rest my personal belief in the truth of the fourth Gallican proposition upon that very circumstance, were other reasons wanting. For if Christ's promise to teach his Church all truth, and to abide with her to the end of time, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her, in which her *infallibility* consists, were to be accomplished in the personal

personal inerrancy of the head of his Church, every Christian would be under an indispensable obligation of submitting to the Papal decrees upon the Christian revelation, and so serious an obligation could not subsist without infallible certitude of the time, manner, and authority, which should call forth the Christian to exercise the universally indispensable duty of submission and obedience. Catholics do hold, as a decided article of their faith, that in expounding the *Christian revelation*, the *Church* of Christ cannot err: and in that rests her *infallibility*; the belief of which is a conscientious duty in every Catholic: as is also the belief of her *indefectibility*, which consists in the continuance of *Church Government* by the uninterrupted succession of legitimate pastors to the end of time. Neither of these two qualities or attributes of the Church, which carry with them their corresponding duties of submission, can be ensured by natural means; they depend solely upon the promises of Christ, and they both appear to me (a simple layman) to be a doctrine absolutely inseparable from any religious system grounded upon Christian revelation. * The learned Bishop of Chester, Dr. Pearson says, *By virtue of his all-sufficient promise, I am assured, that there was, now is, and hereafter will be, as long as the Sun and Moon endure, a Church of Christ one and the same*; consequently teaching the doctrines,

2 D

which

* Church and State, 218.

Insidious
views in
pressing
the adop-
tion of the
Gallican
proposi-
tions.

which Christ taught : and they are irreformably true.

*The germ of the present mischief, which Doctor Milner (speaking for himself, and to his own flock) said he saw in the articles, must necessarily refer to, and import that scandalous abuse of them, by which those schismatical intruders upon the unanimity of the Catholic flocks in the British Empire, were vauntingly attempting to ensnare them. The wicked doctrines and practices, which those intruders upon the unity, peace and obedience of the Catholic folds, openly preach up and defend by their sophistical reasonings, and false constructions, necessarily cautioned both the English and Irish Bishops against the solemn adoption of a declaration, then actually stretched upon the rack, to extract from it an insidious varnish, to give plausibility and currency to the most arrogant, rank, and scandalous propositions of schism, error, and falsehood. You appear to me, Rev. and most learned Doctor, to be uncommonly anxious to make good your boast of the innocence of your enemy's observation, that no proposition in Columbanus's works can be laid hold on, but they are novel. It is not easy to discern his meaning, but yet there is an obvious meaning. No man, reading the following lines, could be at a loss to affix the obvious, and a very unfounded and malicious meaning to them. * "Those Bishops were "not pressed by any legitimate authority, to pro- "nounce any opinion on the subject" (viz. the civil consti-*

constitution of the French Clergy, and the *Concordat*) “ but they would shew the public, that they can
 “ decide on *all matters* appertaining to faith and dis-
 “ cipline *exclusively* ; and so they passed a Synodical
 “ decree in favour of the *Concordat* against Abbè
 “ Blanchard, with whose writings in favor of the
 “ Bourbons they would have done wisely not to in-
 “ terfere.” Most men, looking no further into the
 matter, than the words of Columbanus, would obvi-
 ously understand by them, that the Irish Catholic
 Bishops had volunteered the business, that against
 prudence or exigency they had obtruded worse than
 officious opinions upon their flocks, on matter out of
 their competence or jurisdiction ; that in so diverg-
 ing from their spiritual department, they had plunged
 into a species of civil criminality, in the eyes of many
 scarcely short of treason, by commending Bona-
 parte, our inveterate enemy, at the expence of the
 dethroned and exiled Bourbons, whom we counte-
 nance, subsidize, and affect to support against the
 usurper ; and that they prostituted the sacred autho-
 rity of a national synod to the profane purpose of
 putting down a clerical individual, merely because he
 had decried the Concordat, and published political
 opinions favourable to the Bourbons. No reason-
 ing, narrative, or refutation could elucidate this sub-
 ject so intelligibly and forcibly, as the whole of the
 declaration of the Bishops assembled in Synod at

Tullov, which I recommend to the lecture of all your and my own countrymen.* By that they will discover not only your obvious meaning, but the obvious meaning of each of the actors in that whole transaction. They will obviously perceive, that Dr. Milner neither acted, nor spoke as agent to the Irish Clergy, that the Irish Bishops manifested no obtrusive interference, but condescended, though not *canonically* (or according to your quibbling *salvo*, not *legitimately*) compelled to notice the obtrusive and irregular appeal of Blanchard to them from the condemnation and censure of his legitimate pastors, that not one of the specifically condemned propositions of Blanchard, nor a single word in the Prelate's declaration, either directly or indirectly injures the Bourbons, or favours the enemy. They will read in the few lines I last quoted from you an *obvious meaning* in the writer of them, of a fractious, proud, and turbulent disposition, of disaffection and calumny to the Irish Hierarchy, of disrespect, contumacy, and disobedience to the Holy See, of contempt, hatred, and revenge to the Bishop of Castabala, and of countenance, sympathy, and co-operation with the condemned and censured Blanchard.†

Your

* For which vide Appendix, No. VI.

† The necessity of making early head against these turbulent schismatics, both by those English Catholic Bishops, into whose folds they are labouring to introduce their unsound and unwholesome doctrines, and by all the Irish Hierarchy, to whom

Your antipapistical zeal, Rev. and most learned Doctor, has made such devouring progress upon you within the last two years, during which the canvas for Elphin has irretrievably failed, that you leave behind at an awful distance the antipathy, acrimony, and contumacy of Blanchard, Gaschet, and all their overt and occult partizans. They ground their objections to Pius VII. upon the *Concordat*, which removed both the sin and the scandal of the *Civil Constitution of the Clergy*, condemned by his predecessor Pius VI. To you, every Pope is fair game to decry, and

Excess of
Columba-
nus's Anti-
papacy.

a public and solemn, though informal and irregular, appeal had been lodged against the regular censure of their own Bishops, may be obviously discovered, from some extracts from their publications. Gaschet terms the allocution of Pius VII. (for which vide Hist. of Ireland from the Union, &c. 2 Vol. p. 27.) *a lying, cheating, piece of business*. (Let. Apol. p. 114.) He affirms it to be blasphemy to pronounce the name of the Pope in the canon of the mass, (p. 173) denying, that the Pope, is in the church, or in communion with it. (179) He appeals to the tribunal of the universal church against the Pope and his Bishop. He denies the validity of the faculties of the English Catholic prelates. He persists in rejecting the communion of Pius VII. and declaring him to be a false Pope, who has lost all the authority and dignity in the church, (p. 202) and vindicates his declaration, that the Pope is to him like a heathen or a publican." By all those, who wish to acatholicize Ireland, these doctrines will be relished, countenanced, and supported. With whom therefore ranks *Columbanus*, the sympathizing friend and professed encourager of their authors?

and hunt down under a *Protestant Ascendancy*. You quarrel with Pius VI. for *holding the Civil Constitution of the French Clergy to be impious, heretical, schismatical, and on the whole to be rejected* (a pretty climax) and with Pius VII. for *yielding by the Concordat what the dreadful exigencies of the times demanded from a true shepherd of the Christian flock*. Of trivial import are the execrations or the panegyrics of the man, whose praise is censure, and whose censure's praise. They bring, however, into our thoughts analogies of high importance, between very distinct and disparate objects; the Christian primate and the late Catholic Parish Priest of Castlereagh. I shall not wound your feelings by instituting a comparison between a Sovereign Pontiff and an obscure individual, which so exasperated the Abbè Gaschet, your Coadjutor against the Chair of Peter. Vouchsafe, Rev. Sir, and most learned Doctor, to permit a dabbler in Irish history, though gagging in the note of foreign influence, to observe, that similar relations subsisted between the Catholic Parish Priest of Castlereagh, and the last Bishop of Elphin, as now subsist between Pius VII. and every Catholic Bishop throughout the dispersed Churches of Christianity. The Bishop of Elphin, though he ordained you not in the Church of St. John Lateran, yet he committed to you the spiritual jurisdiction, or mission, or superintendence over a portion of his diocese, which no other power, ecclesiastical or civil could have committed to

to you, namely the care or guidance of the souls of all the Catholics in the Parish of Castlereagh, which you received in virtue of your * institution. It would

* Here I make free to repeat an observation, which I made to Sir Richard Musgrave, another of his Reverence's coadjutors, who vaunted, that his *worthy Bishop of Ferns* would not have given him (the Rev. Doctor Gordon) *that living* had his book, (namely, a true history of the Irish Rebellion of 1798) *appeared before his collation*, (Let. to Sir R. Musgrave, p. 91.) "That awful ceremony of *Institution*, which highly as you may treat the *Collation*, is nothing less than an irrevocable power of attorney, given by the Bishop to a person to assume a subaltern part of his own duty, within a given portion of his diocese. The Bishop consequently remains answerable for every neglect, deficiency, or abuse, that may arise out of any hasty, improper, or corrupt collation of this spiritual charge or jurisdiction." I there also remarked, that I gave the Bishop of Ferns credit, (as I also do to the late the Bishop of Elphin) for having instituted the "Rev. Mr. Gordon" (say Doctor Charles O'Connor) "to this living from the best, and indeed the only justifiable motive for conferring the spiritual care of a part of his flock to him for life, viz. conviction from experience of his aptitude. Had he not known his conduct to be edifying and exemplary, his conversation Christian, and his knowledge competent to the sublime function of leading his parishioners in the ways of salvation, he would not, he could not have performed this awful ceremony of *Institution*."

I rather chuse to meet the most learned Doctor Columbanus, upon principles, and with arguments, that had been set forth, and urged by me before the canvas for his promotion to the See of Elphin had failed: for though rash, arrogant, unsound-

would be waste of time to follow you, Reverend and most learned Doctor, through all the blind aberrations from first principles expressly admitted by yourself, the insidious averments in some passages in contradiction to your explicit assertions in others, the inconsistencies and repugnances, into which your false and malicious conclusions incessantly betray you, and the irrelevant and senseless discussions upon false, ignorant, or impossible assumptions, which generally pervade your five letters or addresses to your countrymen. Thus you loosely (without any specific reference) inform your readers, that Sandini said of your great Columbanus, who you assure us *was a genuine Saint, though he was never formally canonized*, because holding the Pope's supremacy, *he yet maintained, that his inferiors could resist his authority. Cæteroqui nemo, quantumvis eruditus & sanctus,*

non ed, scandalous, and dangerous, his opinions are not new. Neither is my representation of a Parish Priest taken from any foreign influence authority. Turner, a Protestant Divine, in *his vindication of the rights of the Christian Church*, p. 124, says, “so
“ though the patron presents, yet the Minister does not officiate wholly (he should have said not *at all*) by the patron’s
“ power, who had only the right of nomination, but by authority of the Bishop, who instituted him, and indeed, whose
“ curate and substitute he is. So common a thing is it for one
“ to chuse or nominate the person, and another to convey to
“ him his authority.”

*non * interdum hallucinatur, cæcutit, labitur*: which you, with some indecent flippancy translate; for saints, however respectable for learning and sanctity are often great fools, though spoken by your great assumed prototype. The three concluding words, *hallucinatur, cæcutit, labitur*, would admirably suit your reverence as a motto to your elucubrations on the decay of church discipline, since the unsuccessful issue of the canvas for Elphin.

For the first time in 1811, you infuse into the minds of your Catholic countrymen, the degrading parallel between Christ's Vicar upon earth and Mr. Charles Abbott, the Speaker of our Imperial House of Commons. † So for instance, the Speaker of the "House of Commons is the first member, but not

Columbanus assimilates the power of the Pope to that of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

2 E

the

* 2 Col. vi. vii. N. B. I quote literally from Columbanus, without vouching for the correctness, any more than the reader will for the fidelity of his translation. I should have humbly Englished those words, *he blunders, he blinks, he trips*. But the enlarged genius of the most learned Doctor scorns to be meanly fettered to literal version.

Nec verbum verbo, curabis reddere fidus
Interpres. Hor. De arte Poet.

A very great fool is he,
Who translates literally.

Version à la Columbanus.

Thus Columbanus translates *illotis pedibus*, carrying their shoes and stockings in their hands. (2 Col. xx. & *alibi passim* sic infideliter.)

† 4 Col. 81.

“ the absolute monarch of that house. He enforces
 “ its *forms* and *usages*, but he makes none ; he pre-
 “ serves legal order. The members do not hold their
 “ seats from him ; they cannot be expelled by his
 “ *fiat* ; he is not master of their suffrages ; he alone
 “ can decide no question. He is the head, but not
 “ the *grand monarque* of that assembly. His office,
 “ as head is, to preserve order, to *enforce a law*.”

This is what I presume your Reverence calls † *a bye-
 blow of disappointed ambition*. Although all *your* read-
 ers must know, many of *mine* may be ignorant of the
 extent of your plastic powers over the Pope and the
 Catholic Church, which acknowledges him for su-
 preme head under Christ. In as short a space of
 time, as was the duration of the canvas for Elphin,
 you have cast his Holiness into three several moulds ;
 of Lewis XIV. *the grand monarque*, George the Third
 a limited Monarch, and Mr. C. Abbott, the Speak-
 er of the House of Commons. “ † I leave it, you say
 “ to the candor of the Scotch, an enlightened and
 “ a learned nation, to judge how far they can de-
 “ pend on a system so repugnant to the most leading
 “ principles and practice of primitive Christianity :
 “ I heartily join with them in their condemnation of
 “ the *absolute monarchy* principles of a Bellarmine.”
 In another place you tell us. † “ Both lead to the
 “ doctrine of *absolute monarchy* : and Bellarmine, who
 “ was

* I Col. 107.

† 4 Col. 41.

‡ 4 Col. 55.

“ was one of the greatest men of his age, meant that
 “ they should. There is a wide difference,” says he,
 “ between the way, in which Bishops succeed the
 “ apostles, and that, in which the Pope succeeds St.
 “ Peter. For the Pope succeeds *propriè*, as one King
 “ succeeds another : but the Bishops *impropriè*, or
 “ by delegation, which admits of no succession. The
 “ Pope succeeds Peter, not in his quality of apostle,
 “ but as ordinary pastor of the whole church, or pri-
 “ mate *jure divino*, and therefore the Pope has juris-
 “ diction from *him*, from whom St. Peter had it, i. e.
 “ immediately from Jesus Christ. But Bishops do
 “ not succeed the Apostles *propriè*, for the Apostles
 “ were not *ordinary*, but *extraordinary*, and delegat-
 “ ed and deputed pastors, who could have no succes-
 “ sors. At Episcopi non succedunt propriè Aposto-
 “ los ; Apostoli non enim fuerunt ordinarii sed ex-
 “ traordinarii, et quasi delegati pastores, *qualibus non*
 “ *succeditur*. De R. Pont. L. 4. C. XXV. Fol. Edit.
 “ Colon. p. 884. Ita verò, *et non aliter*, succederè
 “ Episcopos Apostolis probatur, nam nullam habent
 “ partem veræ Apostolicæ auctoritatis ! ib. p. 882.”

Here follow his arguments against episcopal juris-
 diction of divine right, and he concludes, “ that the
 “ government of the church is monarchical !” Who
 would have imagined, that all this had been said or
 quoted for the purpose of charging the Pope with
 absolute despotism, by the man, who had within
 some few months declared, * “ that the government

“ of the Catholic Church is not an Oriental despot-
 “ ism, nor a feudal monarchy, but a *mixed Govern-*
 “ *ment*, such as it is described by the most Papal of
 “ all the Papal writers themselves.” *Little will it
 be suspected by those, who have not been enlight-
 ened, by your *recondite erudition*, most learned Doc-
 tor, that all these, and many other things of like ten-
 dency published by you, of the Holy See, would
 have been followed up by a declaration in one place
 given in Latin, in another in English, beginning
 with these words: “ I protest most solemnly, that I
 “ entertain the most sincere respect for the Aposto-
 “ lic See of St. Peter, as the head of all, and that I
 “ never will depart one inch from the canonical obe-
 “ dience, which is due to that See.” §

You

* “ Doctores Catholici in eo conveniunt, omnes, ut
 “ regimen ecclesiasticum hominibus a Deo commissum,
 “ sit illud quidem Monarchicum, sed temperatum ex aris-
 “ tocratiā & democratiā. Bellarmin, Lib. de Pont. Cap. 5.”
 The learned Doctor Columbanus has quoted nothing even out
 of the *Codex Stowensis*, for the reduction of the chair of Peter
 to a level with that of Mr. Abbott.

§ As I am to presume, that Columbanus has made this so-
 lemn declaration by way of announcing to the world at large,
 that he was a Roman Catholic at the time of writing it, it is
 given in the Appendix, No. VII. and the reader will then
 judge of its tendency: that is, whether it be not less an act of
 submission to the Holy See, than an attempt to justify refrac-
 tory doctrines against it. It is given in Columbanus's own La-
 tin, and his own English, for the purpose of displaying the
 punctilious rigor, with which he acts up to his profession.

You cannot, Rev. Sir, and most learned Doctor, State in-
 presume, that a person, that has attained his first ^{trigue a-}
 grand climacteric, and who, in 1795, wrote a quarto ^{gainst the}
 volume with the general view of *enquiring into the* ^{Religion of}
origin, nature, and extent of ecclesiastical and civil pow-
er, with reference to the British Constitution, as the ^{Ireland.}
 title of my *Church and State* announces, and with the
 particular intent and hope of demonstrating, that the
 discrepancy of the oath of supremacy, as it is termed
 from the laws, upon which it is supposed to be bot-
 tomed, and to which it refers, renders it unlawful for
 a Roman Catholic *salvâ fide* to subscribe to, should
 not have made up his mind upon all the hackneyed
 objections against the jurisdiction of the Sovereign
 Pontiff, which you have obtruded upon the public,
 with a profuse garnish of effrontery, plagiarism,
 boast, egotism, and misrepresentation. This you
 have done in a most unseasonable hour, and mis-
 chievous manner, to the prejudice and danger both
 of Church and State, not only to divide the clergy
 amongst themselves, but to separate the laity from
 the hierarchy. You have worked up a fardel of all
 the anti-papal combustibles of the three last centuries,
 and launched it like a fire-ship into the very center
 of your country's fleet. You possibly may have read
 in

“Wherever a passage is obscure I explain it by the author's
 “context, wherever it is clear, I give its *plain, obvious,* and ad-
 “mitted meaning. I cannot charge my conscience with mis-
 “representation.”

in my *Historical Review* * of a tool of Lord Strafford (one of the *false friends* of Ireland) who was himself a Catholic, having been insidiously sent from England to deceive and mislead the body of Catholics: and that fatal adviser of the crown boasted, that he had completely duped him in his mission. “The
 “instrument I employed knows no other, but that
 “the resolution of the State here is set upon that
 “course, and that I do this privately *in favor and*
 “*well-wishing* to divert the present storm, which
 “else would fall heavy upon them all, being framed
 “and executed by the Earl of Cork, which makes
 “the man labour in good earnest, taking it to be a
 “cause *pro aris & focis*.” You, Rev. Doctor brave every effort of your employers to deceive you. You anticipate and outrun their deepest schemes; you undertake to realize, what your great patron’s prototype, the *loyal-hearted, the unsophisticated* Ormond boasted only of the possibility of doing: that is † “so
 “to divide them, and engage some of them against
 “others, that much safety will be thereby derived to
 “his Majesty’s interests, and to his Protestant subjects here. And if these considerations fail, I shall
 “look out the fittest temptations.” You have already published five books of temptations, extracted with rapid and malign industry, out of the collection so mysteriously translated from Belanagare to Stowe. How many more will follow I affect not to divine:
 not

*I Vol. 121. † Vide antea p.104.

not possessing, like your Reverence, or your Biblioplist, Dodsley, the *conscia flamma futuri*. Strafford's and Ormond's duplicity, their political reserve, and their rooted hatred to Catholic Ireland, would never have been ascertained, had not their confidential letters been afterwards published, though evidently not written with a view to publication.

Little boots it to the public to know, under whose or what commission, for what consideration in possession, or expectancy, whether from disappointment at past failure, or in prospect of future success, you have within these two years started to evangelize your countrymen, beat up for recruits to resist Popes and Synods, and to panegyryze the spirit, councils, and measures of the present intolerant ministry. You assert, * “ that the Catholic religion has deteriorated in Ireland, instead of being improved ; a new discipline has been introduced, which was unknown to our ancestors, and which is diametrically hostile to the civil constitution of the country.” You devote a large portion of your second Letter to the proofs of religion not being the true cause of your national hatred to † England. “ Neither was it you say

Columbanus traduces his Country.

* 2 Col. LIX.

† I have repeatedly referred to the inconsistencies of Columbanus, and perhaps he exemplifies this admirable quality in a Doctor of Divinity and a national exclusive historian, in no instance more distinctly, than in putting on and off English and Irish prejudices. We have remarked, that in July, 1802,

“say, the cause of the penal laws.” With your usual inconsistency, you elsewhere boast that your
 “Ancestors

he had washed off the rouge. In 1810, he says, (2 Col. 6) “I
 “will dare to write with inflexible candor. I will dare to cha-
 “racterize the present race of Englishmen a magnanimous and
 “most interesting people. I will dare to say, that England is the
 “only seat of rational liberty now existing on the face of the
 “globe.” Again (5 Col. 123) “Englishmen! all you, whose
 “generous and heavenly sentiments of liberty of conscience,
 “it is impossible for Irishmen not to admire.” Again (2 Col.
 197) “Irishmen, countrymen of all parties! Men, whose very
 “errors I respect, because I know your worth, and I love the in-
 “genuous candour of your minds: Whether you hate, or whe-
 “ther you *respect* England as I do.” Remarking upon the
 leading feature in Irish history for many centuries, which was
 (2 Col. 7) *hatred to the English name and nation: hatred, deep,*
gloomy, inveterate, he adds “These provocations on the part
 “of England are candidly acknowledged. They are acknow-
 “ledged even with indignation by all the great and good men
 “of the Empire. What then? Are the crimes of the preceding
 “century to be imputed to this? As well might we attribute
 “to the present Church of England the corruptions of the Eng-
 “lish Bible, which are noticed by *Ward*, and corrected in the
 “genuine edition of that Bible, as read in English churches by
 “Act of Parliament.” Here follows a curious note introduced
 by Columbanus in his habitual excellency for relevant adapta-
 tion and historical consistency.” How wise was it to revive an-
 “cient heats long consigned to oblivion, by reprinting *Ward*,
 “I will leave to the secret hierarchy of *invisible conscience* to de-
 “termine. Was it that the Church of England should correct
 “its bible? Certainly not. Was it to upbraid the Indepen-
 “dents, who beheaded Charles I. with having corrupted the
 “sacred text? Most undoubtedly not. Was it to fire the

* “Ancestors suffered martyrdom for articles of revealed faith. They lost their properties for maintaining
2 F

“Irish Catholic against the English heretic. That would be too uncharitable, I will not suppose it.” This *unprejudiced* Irishman, who thus shews himself so tender of the English, and so devoutly zealous to eradicate from his countrymen every shoot and every sucker, from which *hatred to the English name and nation* could sprout, spread, or fructify, has had the patriotic consistency to engraft a choice scyon upon the treble-bearing stock of *Irish metrical brevity*. Referring to the times, when the British Monarchs first assumed the title of *Head of the Church*, he sedulously (and I will here credit him for accuracy) perpetuates the early lesson then usually infused into the mouths of Irish sucklings, to grow up with them, and to be transmitted by them to their issue in interminable succession.

Et nati natorum & qui nascentur ab illis.

The children of the now existing race,
And those, whom future progenies will trace.

The reader will judge, whether *Ward's Errata* of the Protestant Bible, or Columbanus's verses against the *Sassanagh*, be the more likely to perpetuate *hatred to the English name and nation*. (1 Col. 90) “The following Irish verses were then taught by nurses to lisping children, and unfortunately they then conveyed *truth*,” (It would have been desirable, that this *Anglo-Hibernian* could have added, they *now* no longer do.)

“Na din Comman re fear galda, ma nir ni fairde dhuit.

“Beidh choidhe ar tidh do mhealta comman ad fhuir ghalda riot.”

Anglicus Angelus est, cui nunquam credere fas est :

Cum tibi dicit AVE, velut ab hoste CAVE.

The Rev. and most learned Doctor has had the redundant

* 1 Col. 10,

“ taining the doctrines of the *Trinity*, the incarnation
 “ the sacraments.” Notwithstanding, the Irish Ca-
 tholic

caution to guard this valuable cutting from being nipped, or checked in its growth, by the decay or extinction of the Irish language, when *Columbanus* shall be no more. He has favoured us with a Monkish distich in Latin, purporting (I am to presume) to express the meaning of those rudiments of Irish patriotism. Like the hypochondre's bubble (*Vid. Ant. p. 141*) he has encased them in Roman Christal, in order to secure the precious relics to the latest posterity: but whether of his own manufactory, or taken down ready made from the shelves of Stowe, he has not condescended to impart to his inquisitive readers. Either supposition has its use. If plagiarisms, they bespeak a facility of quotation: a valuable quality in a librarian. If genuine, they evince an ability to render the old Irish national annals into Latin verse. As I am ever ready to co-operate in the propagation of truth (though probably with a different view from the Columbanian Doctor) I shall attempt to English the Latin, for the benefit of such of my readers, as understand not that dead language, nor its more ancient, though still living tongue, the Irish.

Mistrust a Briton, though as angel fair;
 When he says, HAIL; as of a foe beware.

After he had discharged his bilious acrimony at Doctor Poin-
 ter, for having published a short pamphlet of 44 pages, as a
theological examination of the doctrine of Columbanus contained in
his third letter on the spiritual jurisdiction of Bishops, and the dif-
ference between a Bishop and a Priest, he furiously bounds from
 particulars to generals, “ we Irish have our national vices, (4
 Col. 25) “ so have other nations, not many millions of miles
 “ distant from us on the globe. We run the race of valour;

tholic Bishops * “ have already taken the oath of
 “ allegiance, expressly disclaiming all foreign tem-
 “ poral power, † their Irish ideas on this subject re-
 “ quire to be chastened by those of the Gospel.”
 Then putting a question upon the existing form of
 2 F 2 Church

“ we claim the palm of generosity; and whilst, I trust, that
 “ the lustre of our virtues may shine with a more radiant light,
 “ when polished by new arrangements, I also trust, that the
 “ lustre of our vices shall never derive a deeper tinge from fo-
 “ reign principles of vicarial duplicity. *Pereat illa dies, infax-*
 “ *usta carbone notanda.* Were I to balance national virtues
 “ and vices, I would prefer the rude onset to the courtly poi-
 “ son, the honest insult to the treacherous smile. Give me
 “ *Irish honesty* and I will start with it against all the *fine* vir-
 “ tues of all the *fine* nations of the globe. If I know any thing
 “ of friendship, and surely no Irish heart was ever yet a stran-
 “ ger to its generous feelings, its very essence consists in in-
 “ genuous candor, frankness and honesty of soul. Perish that
 “ smile, under which is concealed the rancour of any of the
 “ corroding passions! The sacredness of friendship is pro-
 “ faned by a shew of cordiality, which always assassinates,
 “ when it is not accompanied with the sunshine of the mind,

“ The partial balance and deceitful weight,

“ The treach’rous smile, a mask for secret hate,

“ Hypocrisy, formality in pray’r,

“ And the dull service of the lip were there.”

Such is the erudite, the demonstrative scholium of the most
 learned Doctor *Columbanus* on the patriotic Irish baby song,

Mistrust a Briton, though as angel fair;

When he says, HAIL, as of a foe beware.

* 2 Col. 96. † 2 Col. 122.

Church government in Ireland, you ask, (by way of drawing an inference) whether * “that Priest and that Bishop, who have taken the oath of allegiance against the Pope’s *indirect* temporal power, are not guilty of perjury?” You represent your countrymen † “divided in their councils, and idly factious, or turbulently discontented. † Is it not a well known fact, that our lower orders are becoming unmanageable in the extreme? What are our *Caravats* and *Shanavests*? Are there not more murders committed now in one year, than formerly in twenty? Is not an Agrarian law proclaimed by nocturnal incendiaries? Are not menaces held out and enforced against landlords, who let, and against farmers, who take lands at a higher rate, than is determined on by *Threshers*: and whilst our population encreases in numbers, and in ignorance, in moral depravity, and in physical strength, is it not true, that the influence of the Parish Priest, which ought to increase proportionably, is visibly on the decline? The manners of the lowest orders of Ireland are at once ferocious and fawning, hospitable and suspicious. § I am aware,” say

* 1 Col. 7. † 4 Col. 87, 88.

§ It is irksome to be obliged to quote so largely from Columbanus, in order to prove (he has charged me with having made assertions without proof) to my readers, that since the unsuccessful canvas for the see of Elphin, he has laid more

say you, * “ that there are some orators who look
 “ with a watchful eye, to a federal union with their
 “ brethren beyond the Atlantic.” In the next page,
 you undertake to shew, how monstrous a doctrine it
 is, and how injurious to the state, and to the separate
 interests of the Catholics themselves, “ that their
 “ Bishops can derive nomination from a foreign
 “ court, even though that court may be engaged in
 “ avowed hostility to their own separate interests.”
 You hold forth the Catholic Bishop rendering † “ his
 “ *spiritual* power a temporal sword, whose hilt is
 “ somewhere in France, and whose point lunges at
 “ every Catholic in the British Isles. You assert,
 that ‡ “ the rude ignorance of the mass of our
 “ people, placed them beyond the reach of that
 “ knowledge of *genuine* Catholicity, which distin-
 “ guishes the gentry of Ireland, beyond those of eve-
 “ ry other country in Europe. A superstitious and
 “ sottish opinion of the Pope’s power, as dark, as
 Erebus

mischievous and danger to the account of the Catholic Hierarchy
 of Ireland, than Doctor Duigenan, Sir Richard Musgrave, Lord
 Redesdale, and the whole of that A Catholic school. “ Is it
 “ not true,” says he, (iv Col. 88) “ that for the purpose of
 “ preserving unlimited and uncontroled dominion, our foreign
 “ influence Bishops are endeavouring still more to oppose those
 “ salutary measures, which would arrest the progress of so ma-
 “ ny calamities to our country?”

* 2 Col. xiii.

† 4 Col. 29.

‡ Ibid.

“*Erebus*,* as confused as ignorance could make it,
 “ held the unshaken empire of its leaden sceptre over
 “ their minds.” Then, by way of reviving (or rather
 of keeping alive and tracing from that period) this
 caliginous spirit, you impressively assure your read-
 ers (5 Col. 417) that “ they see these principles,”
 (viz. *of consenting to any declaration of Allegiance,*
which Irish Catholics might, for political reasons, be
compelled, or be willing to make to the King) “ main-
 “ tained by Bishop Burke, and by the *ad libitum* Vi-
 “ cars Apostolic, and Bishops of Ireland down to our
 “ own times ; and can it be supposed, that any Pro-
 “ testant Government will grant *unqualified* emanci-
 “ pation, as long as such principles are maintained.”

Columba-
 nus insults
 and injures
 his coun-
 try's religi-
 on.

After having undertaken to defend the injured
 character of Archbishop Usher, and commended (it
 is to be wished you had followed) his accuracy of
 quotation, although you say he quoted more manu-
 scripts, than Bishop Milner seemed to have read print-
 ed books, you close a sort of comparison of the
 two Prelates with those words, which appear to me
 most unwarrantably and basely to assume principles
 and

* How does this agree with (5 Col. 11)? “ Every attempt
 “ to abuse the piety of the people, and to take advantage of
 “ their ignorance, Columbanus's heart swells with the gene-
 “ rous eagerness of his ancestors to oppose ; and his pen is de-
 “ termined, in defiance of all calumny, to detest.”

and dispositions in the Bishop of Castabala, and the Catholic Irish Hierarchy in general favourable to Bonaparte, and corresponding with Usher's adoption of Calvinistical doctrines * and support of the bloody persecution and usurpation of Cromwell. † "Every where candid and ingenuous, even where his arguments are untenable, if there is any flaw in his character as a Bishop, it is from the violent fanaticism of his times, he countenanced those horrible principles of persecution, which divided his country, and prevented its coalescing in one mass against the common enemy, contributed to establish the usurpation of Cromwell, as *the same principles*, if not counteracted in time, will infallibly

* You say, " he was principally concerned in framing the articles of faith for the Church of Ireland, in 1615, in which he inserted the nine Calvinistical Articles of Lambeth." The Calvinistical and Jansenistical sympathies, and secret propensities, community of principle, and similarity of conduct, are clearly in the Appendix, No. 111. developed and traced from the great leaders of each sect under the attractive guise of *remonstrants* in the 17th century, the insidious *title* of *protesting Catholic Dissenters* in the 18th, and behind the variegated mask of reformation, purity, antiquity, patriotism, nationality, conciliation, liberty, and sanctity, down to the outrageous extravagancies of *Columbanus*, in five Addresses to his countrymen to bury the very venerable relics of the Irish adherents to the chair of Peter, under a Royal *Veto*, ministerial tools, and a national church. (3 Col. 5).

† 1 Col. 51.

“ bly lead to the usurpation of Buonaparte.” Having by a most extravagant assumption distorted the accepted meaning of *Ultramontanism*, into a Papal right to the temporal crown and sovereignty of the kingdom (an idea which I am confident does not possess the mind of one individual out of five millions) you insultingly to your countrymen and to truth interrogate. * “ Shall we pretend, that no such notions operate now, whilst *every one sees* their influence in the *appointments* of our Bishops?” You then add in a note, “ The following pages will shew, “ that the Pope’s temporal power is still strong “ enough, by means of *exclusive* Synods to wield the “ popular fury against the Catholic gentry of Ireland.” † You omit no opportunity of traducing your

* 2 Col. 70.

† The reader may judge a little of the boasted candor of Columhanus, who gives the following title to the XIII Sec. of his Historical Address (2 Col.) “ *Influence of the Pope’s “ temporal dominion on the mass of the Irish people down to our own “ times.*” In that section he refers to the turbulent times of Charles I. and says some uninteresting and inconclusive things of Lynch, the author of *Cambrensis Eversus*, O’Ferral, Walsh, Preston, and Primate Lombard. The last paragraph of this Section, is all that he offers to his reader to make good his insidious title. It will hardly be credited, unless seen. “ The “ prevalence of these ultramontain notions, so hostile to the security of our state, and the countenance they experienced “ from the Roman Court down to our times, *is manifest* (mark “ this candid reader) from Antonius Brodinus’ *Descriptio Hy*

Your countrymen, which you conceive will let them down, vilify and calumniate them in the eyes of your

2 G delegators

“ *berniæ*, published at Rome in 1721, in which the same doctrine is strenuously maintained in the second chapter, intitled, *De translatione domini Regni Hiberniæ, in Regno Angliæ*, where he adds, that it is the *universal* opinion of the Irish people. This work has the *approbatio S. Magistri Apostolicæ* prefixed to it, and is dated from the *Minerva*, xiv. Septembris 1721 !” I must here take the liberty of reminding my readers, that this reference to Brodinus, such as it is, comes from a *very unfaithful quoter*; next, that Brodinus, whoever he were, that wrote this work for the approbation of *S. Magister Apostolicus*, at Rome in the days of our first George, could be no evidence of the treasonable disposition of the Irish people at that time: nor will many of my readers consider the distance of a century exactly as our own times. So far was the prevalence of this extravagant ultramontaniam from being *manifestly* traced down to our own times, or even to those of George I, that I confidently assert, that in the year 1721, or at any time since, would it have been as difficult to discover an Irishman, really wishing, expecting, or attempting to place the Crown of Ireland upon the Pope’s head, as it would have been at the same time to have found an Englishman traversing the kingdom under a crutched wallet to collect Peter Pence for his Holiness at Rome. Reader withhold your indignation. The quoting librarian gains the ascendancy over the *erudite Doctor*. In order to delude the ignorant and unwary, he gives in a note the words of *Brodinus*, which refer not to the universal opinion of the Irish people up to our own times, or even to the days of George I. when he published his work; but only to the days of Henry II. in the 12th century. (2 Col. 94) “ *Henricus II. prospectum habens quod Hybernica natio adeo devota remaneret sedi Apostolicæ, ut ibi passim omnes profiterentur dominium suæ Regionis*

delegators and instigators. * “The factions of Catholic and Protestant, which shallow politicians supposed to have been the chief, if not the only cause of civil perturbation heretofore, are now known to be only secondary to other objects, and of a tendency very different from that of maintaining *religious* opinions.” Within three pages, after having catechised your countrymen about endeavouring to bring themselves into notice by fury, and to gain influence by ferocity, you properly conclude, “that the only respect, to which we can lay claim, must arise from the *awe of our virtue*, and not from the dread of our brutality.” You go on. “I am sorry to be compelled by those recent transactions, and by many others,” (including, I presume, the canvas for the reversionary See of Elphin) “which have occurred within these last three or four years, even at public trials at bar, to acknowledge in cool, dispassionate argument, that a reformation is indispensably necessary in the internal discipline and œconomy

“ad jus pertinere Romani Pontificis.” If these very bad Latin words be genuine quotation, they are thus fairly translated. Henry II. having a prospect, that the Irish nation would remain so devoted to the Apostolic See, that they all would severally profess, that the *dominium* of their country belonged of right to the Roman Pontiff. Pray, gentle reader, poise the *Irish honesty*, with which the influence of the *Pope's* temporal dominion on the mass of the Irish people, is brought down to our times, by *Columbanus Meridicus*.

* 1 Col. 5.

“ œconomy of the Irish Church ; for these facts
 “ clearly demonstrate, that an Anti-Christian spirit
 “ of *wordly pride*, and temporal dominion has cor-
 “ rupted the ancient humility, the ingenuous can-
 “ dor and the simplicity of our ecclesiastical manners,
 “ and that *conscientious* Catholics have more just
 “ cause to be alarmed for the total extinction of the
 “ sanctity of the *Island of Saints*, than to fear those
 “ salutary restraints of *legal responsibility*, avowedly
 “ consistent with their faith, which *sober antifanati-*
 “ *cal statesmen* (Perceval and Co. as well as some
 “ other *fautores secreti*) endeavour in pity to the Irish
 “ people to interpose, as an *Ægis* of defence between
 “ their liberties, and the usurpations of the uncon-
 “ trouled Maynooth *imperium in imperio*, which is
 “ insidiously styled the *independent Hierarchy* of the
 “ Irish Church.” This you elsewhere say, *is in fact*
an uncontrouled temporal patronage of 200,000l. per
annum.

You close your specification of the things to be
 performed after the death of a Catholic Bishop, with
 a proposition, that appears to me, as a simple layman,
 to involve ignorance, falsehood, and error. * “ Last-

Columba-
 nus's fur-
 ther argu-
 ments
 against sub-
 mission to
 the Pope.

2 G 2

“ ly

* 1 Col. 86. It involves *ignorance* by supposing *confirmation*
 or *nomination* to be the same thing: the first can only proceed
 from the spiritual power conferring *spiritual jurisdiction* or mis-
 sion, which Columbanus (1 Col. 105) admits *must be indepen-*
dent of the civil power, upon the nominee; whereas the nomina-
 tion, wherever there is a *civil establishment* given by the state to

ly, the metropolitan is to agree with the civil power
 in the *confirmation, or nomination* of one of the three,
 “ *without*

the Catholic religion, (*not otherwise*) usually rests in the civil magistrate or its subordinate deputy. 2^o *Falsehood*, in as much, as it supposes, that the Catholic Bishops of Ireland ever received *confirmation* or the collation of spiritual power or jurisdiction *without any reference to any foreign jurisdiction*, in the more ordinary sense of the word *foreign*, and as it is used in the oath of supremacy. 3^o *Error*, in as much as the *spiritual jurisdiction* (or mission) of every Bishop or Church Governor in Ireland, as well as throughout all the dispersed churches, is limited by geographical boundaries. He can neither assume an extension of his own mission, nor grant mission or jurisdiction to any other person beyond the meres or bounds, to which the head of the church, *quem penes arbitrium est & jus & norma*, thought proper to extend the confirmation or collation. The utter impossibility of any human individuals deriving *confirmation*, or the valid collation of *spiritual jurisdiction* constituting him a Bishop or Church Governor, *without any reference to any foreign jurisdiction*, (thereby meaning the See of Rome whilst no general Œcumenical council is actually sitting) has been recently exemplified, in the creation by the present Pope Pius VII. of a new hierarchy on the western continent in the United States of America. This circumstance illustrates the truth of a genuine Catholic's belief, that there must be an efficient, permanent, and indefectible source of jurisdiction in the Church, from which mission or real spiritual jurisdiction may at all times be drawn, independent of all civil power, whenever the exigencies of the church may require it; for which end it is requisite, that there should be one supreme pastor. Church Government could not be continued without it. All would be confusion. I will not presume the most learned Doctor so unobservant of the ecclesiastical events of the day, as not to have read the edify-

“without any reference to any foreign jurisdiction,” I take the word “foreign,” as used here, to import *papal*; for no man, who knows the author of the words will give him credit for that highly rectified spirit of Christianity, which knows *no difference between the Jew and Greek*. In a word, that you may omit nothing, which can render the representation of your country palatable to those, who have encouraged, enticed, or commissioned you to come forward, you unwarrantably assume, that the Christian Primate will, or rather must, adapt the exercise of his *spiritual rights*, whether holden *jure divino*, or *jure ecclesiastico* to the prevailing interest of some continental power, and then you advance still more unwarrantably,

ing and instructive letter of the North American Hierarchy to their Irish brethren, (as it intimately affects his doctrines, it will be found in the Appendix, No. VIII.) in which they express the “greatest obligations to the venerable Pius VII.; “since it is owing to his wise and Apostolic conduct, that this “portion of the Lord’s flock situated in the United States of “America, has been formed into a regular ecclesiastical province, consisting of the Arch-Bishop of Baltimore, and four “suffragan Bishops.” Perhaps his most learned Reverence, upon reconsideration, may find powers like those of Mr. Speaker Abbott, not precisely adequate to the effecting of so important an object to the Christian Church. His Reverence has been prodigal of his proffers to retract upon the discovery of error: has boasted (1 Col. 9) *I would die for the genuine articles of the Catholic faith, as many of our Ancestor’s have*. Let him come forth, and make good his proffer.

warrantably, upon the strength of that assumption to deprive him of them.* “Can any one be so mawkish, as to suppose, that if every Bishoprick is to be derived from the patronage of a foreign power, those, who look for such preferments” (here you speak feelingly) “will not make every effort to please and obey that foreign power in preference to their legitimate government; so that, absolute masters of those, who direct the consciences of the people, foreigners will enjoy a secret influence, and a more extensive and powerful empire, than the sovereign state itself.”

His gross
flattery of
the English

Such, Rev. and most learned Doctor, is the portrait you have exhibited of the present state of your country, in order to ensure its civil freedom from *sober anti-fanatical statesmen*, and the English people, whom you so highly respect, and of whom you say, (*Utinam verè*) † “The Irish character is loved and respected in England for that very adherence to the conviction of their consciences, which has distinguished them in the worst of times.” In the same page you ask, “Is there a man in England, who does not entertain a high respect for the *honest* principles of *conviction*, however they may deem them erroneous? ‡ The generosity, and the good sense of the English of our times makes ample allowances in favor of the Irish, when they contemplate the unprovoked hostility of their own ancestors, “who

* 3 Col. 91.

† 3 Col. 12.

‡ 2 Col. 8, p. 1.

"who were confessedly aggressors." Such nauseating flattery could not be digested by the whole collected powers of the *fine nation*, if every Englishman had the stomach of an ostrich. O Irish honesty of Columbanus! What a monster of adulation hast thou produced?

Did it not suffice you, Rev. Sir, and most learned Dr. that you had with malign industry picked up and administered to the intolerants all the chips and shavings of the over-primed fardels supplied by Doctor Duigenan, Sir Richard Musgrave, and the anonymous and hired bands of firemen, but you should attempt to stimulate their nearly exhausted lust for galling your countrymen, by borrowing from the deistical lips of an officer on the continent, (such unfortunately have in these latter days of infidelity every where superabounded) a sneering sarcasm on the Catholic religion, and applying it to your Catholic countrymen, as an infallible provocative to those, whose abhorrence of that religion is insatiable. By way of corollary to the note before-mentioned,* concerning the motives for republishing *Ward's Errata*, you fly off in the following tangent.† "And yet I recollect, that when the Earl of Cork was on his travels to Parma, an officer of that court informed him, that some very sanctified men, who frequented it, were good Catholics, but bad Christians, who in the name of God had no charity for each other, and

Columbanus attempts to rail at and revile his own religion.

“and no religion. *Nous sommes tous des bons Catho-*
liques, mais pour la religion, nous n'en avons point.”
 (In English: We are all good Catholics; but as
 for religion, we have none at all). Letters from Ita-
 ly London, 1773, p. 61. The external conformity
 with the religion of the state may be found coupled
 with the internal want of Christianity, much nearer
 home than Parma. This quotation may be correct:
 the observation may have been made,; it is sanction-
 ed by the quoter's memory, *and yet I recollect*, but it
 applies not to a Catholic Hierarchy and a Catholic
 People, that have groaned under persecution for
 above three centuries, where, as you express your-
 self, * “religious principles expose men to privation
 “of civil rights, and to degradation from important
 “honours and emoluments.” No matter it is a quo-
 tation; and made by the Bibliothecarian of a *very*
 great man. But does your Reverence anticipate
 much sympathetic gratitude from your Catholic coun-
 trymen, your brethren in faith, for this flattering por-
 trait of them, taken either for their avowed enemies
 or their false friends. Will they, think you, be cu-
 rious to enquire, whether you volunteered and paint-
 ed it as an amateur, whether you executed an order
 for pay, or performed a commission under avowed
 authority, or covert influence. Most of them consi-
 der you, as an un unruly steed without bit, curb, or
 bridle

bridle, dangerous to every one, that comes within your contact,

Equi te

Esse feri similem dico.——HOR.

Like an unruly horse I say,

You rear, you plunge, you lash away.

I have told you most learned Doctor,* that “I perceived you preparing for battle from afar, against your country, your kindred, and the religion of your countrymen. You were making yourself a public man by long anticipation, laying in your pretensions to a name and reputation in life, though at an interminable distance.” The recurrence of these observations to my mind, renews in it your censorious remark upon filling † “my voluminous compilation with assertions without proofs, and with calumnies, which every man at all acquainted with Irish History had read *usque ad nauseam* before I had written to him upon the subject.” In February, 1802, you knew, that I had in my possession a copy of your first volume, the result of *your labours to pursue the truth*, and you probably suspected, that I might put before the public some of the more important truths, which, you on your first apostacy, thought it your duty to your GREAT anonymous patron, to smother in the Poddle. I have now before me, a printed annunciation of your intended publication of that interesting work, dated

2 H

7th

* p. 43

† 2 Col. 222.

The advertisement to the memoirs in 1795.

7th May, 1795. Like every thing you ever sent to Press, it proves the similitude, and the consequent applicability of the Motto prefixed to my Historical Letter, to your sympathetic rival, Sir R. Musgrave. You told me in 1802, "that at a period of extreme political intemperance, and when the minds of all our body were exceedingly agitated, you were induced to compile with a haste, that could only be justified by your good intentions, the memoirs alluded to." Now, the intermediate period between 1793, when your grandfather died, and the greatest benefits were granted to the Catholics and the 7th May, 1795, when you pronounced the first volume *nearly finished*, (proof, that the compilation must have been made before Lord Fitzwilliam took possession of his Government in Dublin on the 4th of January, 1795,) was precisely the least agitated and least intemperate portion of time within the last twenty years. That must have been the period, during which you were preparing your manuscript of the memoirs, to which I can now give a title, which heretofore I was unable to do, viz. "Memoirs of the life and writings of the late Charles O'Connor, Esq. M. R. I. A., to which is prefixed an Historical account of the family of O'Connor, comprehending a very interesting period of *Irish History*, from the reign of Henry II. to the present times." I wonder not at your objections against a man of very different principles from yourself, having undertaken to give an Historical Review of the

the affairs of Ireland for that precise period of time. I assure you, Rev. Doctor, on the faith of *an honest Englishman*, (though I cannot rejoice at Ormond's being my countryman, or at your wishing to become so) that until this *anniversary 7th day of May, 1812*, I knew not, that we so closely coincided in our intentions ; and to speak the plain truth, from the lecture of the preserved volume. I did not collect your announced intent. If any idea of rivalry existed, it could only have been in him, who knew the object of both parties, which I was not then apprized of. But that document (and a very important one it is) expresses your mind and intention on the 7th of May, 1795, seventeen years ago : a period considerably preceding the date of the translation of the O'Connor collection from Belenagare to Stowe. It was announced, that the work then "printing by Subscription and speedily to be published by John Meighan, 49, Essex-street, was compiled principally from notes and extracts taken by Mr. O'Connor HIMSELF (his grandson *nondum minxerat in patris cineres*) from ancient writers on Irish History and MSS. *sources*, hitherto unexplored or not generally known, by the Rev. Charles O'Connor, D.D. *Member of the Academy of Cortona*. The principal persons, from whose correspondence a selection has been made for this work, are Doctor Johnson, Dr. Leland, Lord Lyttleton, Doctor Warner, Henry Brooke, author of *Gustavus Vasa*, Rev. Doctor

2 H 2

" Cantarine,

“ Cantarine, the celebrated friend of Doctor Berke-
 “ ley, Mr. O'Halloran, O'Moore of Ballina, Major
 “ General Charles Vallancey, Doctor Curry, Most
 “ Rev. Doctor Carpenter, Lord Taaffe, Most Rev.
 “ Doctor Troy, Rev. Nathaniel Barton, Mr. Hume,
 “ Lady Lismore, Irish Officers in France, Joseph
 “ Cooper Walker, Esq. the Chevalier O'Gorman,
 “ Mr. Pinkerton author of the History of Scotland,
 “ Rev. Mr. Mac Lagan, and several others.” Every
 candid reader of this advertisemnt will obviously
 trace it to the person, who wrote two letters to
 me in February, 1802, who inserted Mr. Burke's
 Letter in Mr. Dodsley's Register for the same year,
 as a preparative for his anticipated review, which
 graced the subsequent volume for 1803, of a work
 not even concocted in the brain of the *projecting* au-
 thor, and to the hand, that culled out from the Stowe
 collection (and retained in Conaught for some mysti-
 cal purpose) that valuable correspondence, consisting
 of several hundred of original letters on Irish history
 and Irish antiquities, between the revered grandfa-
 ther and the persons before-mentioned, in p. 38.
 You told me notwithstanding, in February, 1802,
 seven years after this pompous announce, that you
 had *sometime since given them* (that is the memoirs)
together with the originals, to the Marquis of Bucking-
ham. There wants some further culling to clear
 away the cloud, in which these originals are still en-
 veloped either in Bucks or Conaught. Your an-
 nounce

nounce gratified your countrymen in 1795 by an assurance, that the work would be embellished with "engravings by the first Irish Artists, and particularly with a striking likeness of *Charles O'Connor, Esq. by Brocas.*" Was he too drowned in Effigy? or hung up at Stowe, as an expiatory oblation, by the *Sacerdos Hesperidum templi Custos*? I boldly, however, prophecy, in defiance of the profligate efforts to raise the unworthy issue into fame, by entombing the virtues of the parent that, as long as there lives an *Irish heart*, the grandfather's memory will be there enthroned in grateful admiration, confidence, and respect.

Semper honos, nomenque tuum laudesque manebunt.

VIRG.

His honor, name, and praise, shall never die:

But alas poor Cortona! Thy panache is no longer worthy of gracing the brow of *Doctorum Doctor doctissimus*. When he washed off the rouge, he unfeathered his cap indeed. Then did he enter the following soliloquy into his *Common Place Book*, and unwittingly extracted it to misapply it to one of his countrymen, whom it little fitted; "* forgetting, " because I wish to forget, (happy power of oblivion!) " that some members of literary societies are mere " pretenders; that even learning, supposing it to " exist in their noddles, is found frequently to fail in " the

“ the conduct and direction of life ; that we may be
 “ knowing without being wise, except *in our own*
 “ *conceits* ; and that literary *beaux* (for *Doctors*) sel-
 “ dom discriminate between virtuous adherence to
 “ that, which appears truth, and impudent obtrusion
 “ of indigested notions and half-fledged opinions
 “ upon the understandings of men.”

Some valu-
 ables saved
 out of the
 wreck of
 historical
 truths.

In 1803, you probably discovered in the Historical Review several wrecks of that valuable jumble of excellent materials saved from the indignity of the privy, and the oblivious muds of Lethe and Cocytus.* You there read, (I venture to *assert without proof* with humbled pride and resentful indignation) those admirable words, of your revered Grandfather to Dr. Jennings, in which he refers to a letter he had written to Doctor Johnson, accompanied with a *douceur* of fifty guineas, and an abstract of the Penal Laws, to induce (though in vain) that literary savage to employ his pen in the publication (not the suppression) of the truths of Irish History. * “ I send” (says the *virtuous* Charles O’Conor) “ the Doctor my last
 “ javelin : but I fear I have thrown it in vain. *Men*
 “ *in power will not be convinced. There is an obstina-*
 “ *cy yoked with pride in this case ; and a phantom of*
 “ *hatred stalks behind, to cement the league between*
them.” Lapse of time, disappointed ambition, wounded pride, nay, habits contracted from having been long accustomed to the warm beams of munificent patro-
 nage,

* 1 Hist. Review, 321.

nage may have now rendered your most learned Reverence more cal'ous to home truths, than you were in your earlier apostacy from filial piety, from national sentiments, from sacred duty. For the sake however of such of your countrymen, as may chance to throw their eyes upon this letter to you, I think it proper to announce to them, that I inserted in my Historical Review, whatever I found interesting and important to Ireland, in your ill-packed cargo of valuables,* and I did it in contravention to the permanent conspiracy

* Almost the whole of what is contained in my Historical Review concerning the prosecution of Mr. Saul, the commencement and views of the first Catholic Committee, of which Columbanus rightly admits Doctor Curry and his grandfather to have been *the fathers and founders* (2 Col. 104). The first publication of Doctor Curry's memoirs, and its effects upon the public, and several matters about that period most interesting to Catholic Ireland, were the gleanings of the first cargo or venture, which Columbanus had speculated in, since his grandfather's death in 1793, (5 Col. 220) when he was allowed access to, or permitted to have the use of, or had worked himself into some sort of possession of that invaluable national treasure left by his grandfather. He assured me in 1802 (p. 29) when he had certainly uttered less falsehood than he since has, that this first essay at playing the historian, was undertaken hastily, but with a good intention. He *laboured* to pursue the truth. Let me ask him again, with such choice materials, what prevented him from finding her? What could have induced him after so hard, though quick a labour, to drown the produce like a litter of mongrel puppies? notwithstanding there were so much blood, speed, and sagacity, to be found amongst them. I can readily account from the recreant apostacy of the

conspiracy against the publication of the truth of Irish History. I now confidently appeal to Columbanus's countrymen,

degenerate grandson for his provocation, soreness, and humiliation at the preservation and publication of some of his grand-sire's sentiments and principles so damnatory of his own. But it was not fair, much less liberal in Columbanus to upbraid me for not having seen, and to complain of my having twice misquoted the *Quæremonia Magnatum Hyberniæ ad Johannem XXII.*, when he must have well known, from my having given only extracts of it without date or title, in the words of his *own translation*, that all I had in my power to give or refer to, was from the *poddled* volume of his memoirs. I have often lamented the imperfect state, in which I gave to the public the extracts from that interesting and important document. I remember to have told Mr. Fox, who expressed an earnest wish to see it in the original language, that my inability to procure it, was my sole reason for not having given it. That partial, and perhaps imperfect translation, I thought might lead others to discover or publish the original. Now I call upon my readers to do me justice, and to transplant all the imperfections and disadvantages, under which those *Magnates Hyberniæ* were in 1803 brought before the public, from mine to the shoulders of the Rev. Charles O'Connor, D. D., who amply possessed the means of doing them justice, and giving satisfaction to an inquisitive and interested public. I have indeed heard, but cannot verify the fact of that remonstrance having been framed and signed by the Irish Chiefs at *Moyleurg*. Now what is Ireland to expect from an historian, who having so complete a collection of originals and materials at hand, has made so treacherous, so unfaithful, and so mischievous an use of them? Had I then known him as I now do, in giving his translation of extracts from that remonstrance, I should have been bounden to apprise my readers, that it came from the pen of a man, who misquotes,

countrymen, to my own countrymen, and to the world at large, that I am not unworthy of the judgment of a Grattan, that I was * *one of the very few Irish Historians, who had ventured to deal in the commodity called truth, and that I had done so like a man, with vigour and ability against the tide of power and prejudice*; nor of that of his most worthy and respected relative, † “the present representative of the
 “ancient Chiefs of Moylurg, Hugh Mac Dermot, of
 “Coolavin, who reflects back on his ancestors that
 “manliness of character, that steadiness of principle,
 “and that *Irish mind*, which at every period of our
 “history they displayed.” He scrupled not to §
 congratulate his country on this work having fallen into
 my hands, whom abilities and candor equally qualify for
 the undertaking. In proof of the consistency and constancy of my principles, I refer him to the concluding sentence of that page || in my Historical Review, which labours (I feel not altogether unsuccessfully) to restore suspended animation to many precious subjects dredged out of the suffocating slime of the

2 I

Poddle,

misapplies, and misrepresents history more audaciously and grossly, than any man, whoever aspired to the character of an historian. Yet he has the matchless effrontery to exclaim. (5 Col. 318) *Is Ireland never to have a Historian?* The Boetian impudence to abuse all others. *Such are our Irish Historians, God bless them.* (Ib. 319) The insolent conceit of anticipating his own posthumous renown. *Something whispers into my ear, that I may look with confidence to posterity.* (5 Col. 296)

* Vid. Antea. p. 15. † 5 Col. 271. § Antea p. 12. || 322.

Poddle and the Liffey. There may be read the spirit of the Government, A. D. 1759, when Mr. Saul was assured from the Bench, *that the laws did not presume a Popist to exist in the kingdom; nor could they breathe without the connivance of Government.* The sentence alluded to is: “The probability, or
 “even certainty, that truth will be ill received, is
 “no just excuse for suppressing it, especially when
 “its publication becomes an act of justice to an in-
 “dividual, and much more so to a nation.”

Interesting
 and spirit-
 ed testimo-
 ny of the
 grandfa-
 ther.

The depth of that degenerate renegado malice, of the *incestus, qui minxerit in patrios cineres*, was never fathomed, till his fury *objectos caveæ valuit si frangere Clathros*. Then burst forth his disappointment, his ire, his resentment, his revenge, his rage in clamouring for *Veto*, in traducing Pope and Bishops, in slanderously calumniating the religion of his countrymen. Little do I wonder at his Reverence's severity on me, for having reanimated the grandfather's voice upon these delicate and venerable subjects, as an eternal anathema upon the degenerate, and false opinions of the grandson. The following sentiments of the virtuous grandsire ought not to be read by the degenerate grandson, without throwing him into a paroxysm of rage and madness. *Certe furit.* In writing to Doctor Curry * he tells him, † “In the mean time, you
 “and

* Therefore Doctor O'Connor so studiously labours to discredit both Curry and his grandfather. (5 Col. 219. & *alibi passim* & *turpiter*). † Appendix to Historical Review, 262.

“and all of you, are as passively silent, as sheep be-
 “fore the shearer : you are of opinion, I suppose,
 “that it is not justice due to all parties, to shew by
 “what means, and by whose means, such evils were
 “brought upon us to operate to this day. This
 “Harris’s insolence is seasoned for him, by an opi-
 “nion derived from your silence, that he has defeat-
 “ed us all. For my part, were I you, and had but
 “a pebble, I would cast it against such an illiberal
 “dog : nay, *at every Irishman*, who would be so base
 “as not to be ashamed to mangle the corpse of the
 “fallen, or to rivet the fetters of the oppressed. But
 “alas ! we are a people truly fallen, or we would
 “co-operate with each other systematically in coun-
 “teracting the proceedings of the parties, that are
 “united in nothing, but in a league against us.
 “They offer us a boon ; a registry bill, which is evi-
 “dently calculated to extirpate our very remains.
 “Nothing can be better known, than that our *spiri-*
 “*tual œconomy cannot be exercised without the spiritual*
 “*jurisdiction of our Bishops.* Yet the *jurisdiction of*
 “*Catholic Bishops*, is totally overturned by the bles-
 “sed boon, the *intent of which is therefore to destroy*
 “*Popery by Popery itself.*” This doctrine, which was
 delivered about fifty years before the term *Veto* had
 been appropriated to *that* Anti Catholic conspiracy,
 could produce no other effect upon the unnatural
 and recreant grandson, than an indomitable excess
 of irritation and despair. *Certe furit.*

Refutation
of the illi-
beral at-
tack on the
veracity of
Curry and
O'Connor.

As you most Rev. and most learned Doctor have* charged me with using *language, that can scarcely be tolerated amongst civilised nations*, I profess myself at a loss, to know what language to employ, that will fairly, candidly, and unequivocally express the degree of infidelity, treachery and hardyhood, with which you challenge the character of an historian, and forfeit that of an Irishman and a Catholic Christian. In order to excuse or justify yourself for fixing your grandfather and his friend, confidant and cooperator in the cause of Ireland, Dr. Curry, with falsehood, you arrogantly and petulantly obtrude yourself upon your countrymen to impeach the veracity, cry down the credit, and blast the well earned laurels, with which every true Irishman and advocate of historical truth had entwined the venerated brows of *Curry and O'Connor*. Like your cotemporary Musgrave you deal by wholesale in the two unequivocal badges of fraud, *Suppressio veri & suggestio falsi*. You do it, if possible, with more confident assurance than your rival calumniator of Catholic Ireland. He never recurs to my mind without a satisfactory conviction, that my motto to the Historical Letter to him fitted him to a hair.

Falsus honor juvat & mendax infamia terret
Quem nisi mendosum & mendacem?

Whom, but the man of error or untruth
Doth borrow'd honor please, doth lying shame appal?

You usher in your strained efforts to blacken the
fair

☞ Vide Ant. Pref. VII.

fair character of those two revered and excellent
 Irishmen, *Curry* and *O'Connor* under a most im-
 pudent title of affectation. **Pretended massacre of*
Island Magee. You say "The foreign influence
 "writers, (amongst whom you reckon those two)
 "ashamed of this horrid transaction (the murder at
 "Lurgan on the 5th of Nov. 1641) and endeavour-
 "ing to cast off the odium, when they expected to
 "be included in the act of settlement (i. e. about 21
 "years after) trumped up their clumsy story of a
 "previous massacre, at Island Magee. The first,
 "who mentions this pretended massacre, is an an-
 "onymous collector of stories, entitled *A Collection*
 "of some massacres and murders committed on the Irish
 "since the 23d of October 1641, which were pub-
 "lished first in London, when the act of settlement
 "was in contemplation in 1662." No man will,
 no man ought to believe you ignorant of what the
 Protestant Bishop Nicholson says of Clarendon,
 whom for unavowed and probably unwarrantable
 views, you have found it your interest to raise
super æthera in your 5th Address; viz, that his
 account of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in Ireland
 was penned out of the memoirs and from the oral
 information of the old Duke of Ormond, whilst his
 Grace was in exile with the author. Surely, Rev.
 Doctor, the inspiration of such a Deity never could
 have betrayed your noble and first of historians into
 the relation of such an unfounded, such a wicked,
 such

such a *clumsily trumped up* piece of fiction. Yet his words are. (*Clarendon's Hist. Review of the affairs of Ireland*, p. 329.) "About the beginning of Nov. 1641, the English and Scotch forces in Carrig-fergus, murdered in one night all the inhabitants of the Island Gee (commonly called Mac Gee) to the number of above 3000 men, women and children; all innocent persons, in a time, when none of the Catholics of the county were in arms or rebellion. *Note.* This was the first massacre committed in Ireland, of either side."* In the most

* After this authority for the massacre of Magee, to what account are to be laid the ravings of Columbanus about his grandfather, Lord Clarendon, &c. He affects to lament, that although his grandfather were possessed of a benevolent heart, he had not an *historical disposition* of mind. *Is Ireland never to have an historian? Such are our Irish Historians. God bless them.* I entreat the reader to bear in mind the genuine and honest testimony of the grandfather's veracity from the pen of a *worthy* grandson (p. 33, 4, 5) before I lay before him some of the revolting indignities from the pen of another, who has long boasted of having *washed off the rouge*. (5 Col. 247) I enter my solemn protest against his" (i e his grandfather's) "character of Lord Clarendon, who notwithstanding his chronological errors, and his implicated stile, which is too frequently embarrassed by the length of his periods, is yet the greatest and most classical historian, that England has ever produced. (Ib. 249) "I utterly reject my grandfather's character of Clarendon's history as declamatory and untrue. No protestant writer of his age has done the Catholics so much justice: no Englishman of his age has

most profligate defiance of this evidence of your exalted Protestant witnesses *Clarendon and Ormond*, and with a malignancy unfathomable and incredible, you injure and insult your country by the wicked falsehood that † *the massacre of St. Barthelemy went through a second edition in Ireland.*

Imagine not most learned Doctor, that I am inattentive to your boast, that you * “have not shaped
 “your opinions by the views or the opinions of any
 “man, or of any party in England. Not by Sir
 “John Hippesley’s, who with the best intentions
 “has yet to learn the whole extent, and to calculate
 “the different bearings of a subject, which involves
 “the divine and ecclesiastical rights of the second
 “order of the Irish clergy, as well as of the first,
 “and embraces even the *Civil rights* of the people.
 “Not by Mr. Perceval’s, or by his friend Doctor
 “Duigenan’s, whose measures will never require to
 “be defeated by argument, because they will ever
 “defeat themselves, and they are sufficiently defeat-
 “ed by proceeding from such a source: not by
 “Lord

Columba-
nus abuses
his hiera-
chy.

“treated the Irish with so much respect.” (5. Col. 256)
 “My late grandfather’s statements, as far, as they relate to
 “Lord Clarendon, and to the persecutions of the reign of
 “James down to 1641 are therefore exaggerated, and my
 “respect for his memory, and the sincere regard I entertain
 “for his virtues, his hospitality, and his patriotism shall not
 “induce me to violate the first duty of an historian, *Amicus*
 “*Plato, Amicus Socrates—Sed magis Amica Veritas.*”

* 1 Col. 116.

“ Lord Grenville’s, whose opinions have not yet^d
 (i. e. in 1810) “ been sufficiently unfolded, to ena-
 “ ble us to form a fair and impartial estimate of
 “ their extent in detail.” Never was delusion at-
 tempted without a dash of truth. *Decipimur specie*
recti. You add, however, “ that if no better objec-
 “ tions to Lord Grenville’s opinion can be alledged,
 “ than those, which are founded by the Bishops and
 “ Mr. Keogh, on an effectual negative, that ground
 “ is utterly untenable; and *they* may find abundant
 “ reason *hereafter*, in the invasion and distractions of
 “ their country, to repent the rejection of his opi-
 “ nions, who object to them *now*, upon so futile and
 “ foolish, or rather so wicked and hypocritical a pre-
 “ text.” You are elsewhere more explicit; and be-
 cause the whole Hierarchy and the bulk of the
 Catholic population of your country were una-
 nimous and warm in the reprobation of the *Veto*,
 you most unwarrantably and maliciously assert. * “ I
 “ therefore do not wonder, that the bigotry of igno-
 “ rance, the jealousy to England, the democracy of
 “ revolutionists, and the principles of rebellion and
 “ separation have coalesced against granting a *limit-*
 “ *ted negative* to the civil power in the appointment
 “ of our Bishops. On the contrary, I always fore-
 “ saw, that the most outrageous *opposite* passions
 “ would confederate, in order to prevent every and
 “ any interference, which might tend to restrain the
 “ uncontroled

* I Col. 25.

“uncontrouled dominion of Maynooth” (*Columbanus*’s malign phrase for the Catholic Hierarchy) “within the limits of just, and legal, and necessary responsibility.” The reader will keep in mind, that this invidious battery of criminal accusation is discharged by the most learned Doctor at his respectable Hierarchy, within some few months, after a canvas on behalf of *Columbanus* for the See of Elphin, during the life of Doctor French the late Bishop, which would have added the most learned Doctor to their number, had it not failed.

In the like spirit of resistance and opposition to the Prelates’ synodical resolutions against the *Veto*, (I will not affirm *it to be a bye-blow of disappointed ambition*) you boldly undertake to inform your countrymen, that * “for the purpose of appointing their own successors, they have resisted a limited negative on the part of the state, which if it had been conceded, would have led to extensive arrangements in favour of our poor? One million of our peasantry might have been brought under the necessary discipline and Catholic controul of parochial schools, had it not been for the religious cry so insidiously raised against an arrangement, which would have immortalized the eloquent and noble proposer of it in the House of Lords, and the eloquent and conciliating Patriots, who supported it in the Commons, which would have uni-

Columbanus’s visionary effects of VETO.

2 K

“ted

* 4 Col. 89.

“ted both countries in the strictest bonds of amity;
 “and whilst it endeared to Ireland the memory and
 “the talents of her own children, of a Grattan, a
 “Sheridan, and a Ponsonby, would have also en-
 “deared to her the English nation.”

His wild
 attempt to
 engage
 some
 Statesmen
 to support
 the Veto.

Your Reverence must long since and frequently have been sensible of the extreme folly of an ephemeral triumph from illusion. You wished, you laboured, you intrigued, first to impose upon those Statesmen, with whom you had any connection, or upon whom you, or any of your countrymen had dependence, and then upon your countrymen and the British Empire at large the belief, that all the patriotic talent, influence, and virtue in the Senate stood pledged and arrayed in favour of the *Veto*, as the *sine qua non* of admitting the Catholic population of your country to an equal share of the benefits of the British Constitution with their Protestant brethren. Your new born zeal against the predominant and exclusive right of the Supreme Pontiff's creating church governors, and the clerical influence and sentiment of your own order had not answered in the attempt to place you in the chair of Elphin. Hence your impassioned apostrophes to the law, to the civil magistrate, to lay patronage, to ministers of state, and to commissioners of public boards to open the gates, of which the keys have been hitherto inviolably kept by the Christian Primate, as the ordinary source of all spiritual jurisdiction throughout all the dispersed

persed Churches of Christendom? *Flectere si nequeo superos, acheronta movebo.*

Once let in state influence with a *Veto*, and the church is no longer free: when the collation of spiritual jurisdiction is treated as political favor, the tool of state, not the evangelizer of the poor, and the assertor of Christian freedom will be sought out. Who invented favors, invented shackles: *qui invenit beneficia, invenit & compedes.* The *Veto* once established, how powerfully would not your Reverence's merits be urged with the Ministry, for having laboured so zealously and successfully, in decrying and dividing your countrymen, in extolling British liberality and wisdom, in vilifying and excluding all Papal power and influence, in stigmatizing as perjurers and traitors the whole body of your own hierarchy? But, Rev. Doctor, be not over righteous. *Sapere ad sobrietatem.*

You may for a short hour have duped some unsuspicious men of high honor, even some enlightened Statesmen, because they knew you not, and therefore gave you a credit, which you were not entitled to. You could never seriously think of precipitating them through the entire maze of your own aberrations, without halting, breathing and reflecting. Whatever you, Rev. Doctor, and some of your select, though occult instigators, abettors and co-operators in plucking at the *tiara*, may have done or said, to induce Lord Grenville explicitly to abett the *Veto* in

Effects of
State influence on
Veto.

The real
nature of
Veto seen
by Lords
Grey and
Grenville,
and Messrs.
Ponsonby
and Grat-
tan.

his letter to Lord Fingal, and Lord Grey, to subscribe to the sentiments of it; Whatever crude suggestions of zealous Catholics, little versed in gauging the flattery and insincerity of Statesmen, may have occasioned Mr. Ponsonby and Mr. Grattan to propose a qualified *Veto* in the Commons; yet happily for Ireland, they have all of them since reflected upon the subject, they have turned it in their minds, in all its bearings, they have read * much upon it; they find the general sense of Catholic Ireland to be determinately against it; they do justice to the tried loyalty of the Catholic Prelates, they reject the foul imputation of their being perjured in taking the oath of allegiance, they are satisfied with the security of that legislative test† of loyalty, they are become sensible, that

* I will suppose, they have read and been most affected by the works of *Columbanus*; for it would have been impossible for men of wisdom and experience not to conclude, that such a *farago* of scurrility, scandal, and incoherency was bottomed in falsehood and deception. Advocating a bad cause makes it worse. *Causa patrocini non bona pejor erit.*

† The redundant caution and humiliating negative pleonasm, which indirectly and unwarrantably throw imputations of duplicity and perjury on the juror's ancestors are said to have been the forced production of the elaborate and malign ingenuity of Dr. Duigenan. Never have we yet read or heard of the Right Hon. Doctor's (adept as he is in humiliating his Catholic countrymen) having mistrusted the efficiency of this *chef d'oeuvre* of his art. The first objections to it were reserved for the keener virulence of *Columbanus*, who has devoted a whole section (2 Col. 114) to shew, *the oath of allegiance worse*

that if the existing generation of Catholics should henceforth discontinue to derive their spiritual jurisdiction from the Chair of Peter, they would differ from their ancestors in that very point (most essential to Government) in which their Catholic ancestors differed from those of the reformed religion of the state, they retraced the tried loyalty of the Irish Catholic clergy for the three last centuries, and they arrived at the unavoidable conclusion, that unqualified emancipation could alone ensure permanency to the Constitution in Church and State. Lords Grey and Grenville now saw through the insidious and deceptive projects of those persons, who, though not representing the body of the English Catholics, had with obtrusive anxiety, and under a mysterious assumption of accredited agency drawn and redrawn, privately canvassed and recommended, then published, and lastly presented to Parliament a form of resolution, not inartificially fitted to illaqueate the subscribers in every or any possible proposal or condition however captiously made or imposed.* Then

recurred
than nugatory, until ultramontain ideas of spiritual power are restrained. But not to distress his Reverence with perplexing anacronisms (1 Col.) I date the discoveries made by him in the insufficiency of Doctor Duigenan's oath of allegiance to the year, in which he told his brother (3 Col. 12) "A year has elapsed since you first wrote to me to assist your endeavours for my promotion to that See, Elphin as soon as it should be vacated by the expected death of Doctor French."

* It was a *round robin* of generalities; which bound to every

recurred to their minds the noble precedent of the British Legislature in 1791, which rejected the intrigues of those *soi disant* *Protesting Catholic Dissenters* to confine their intended bounty to them, and exclude from all redress the bulk of the English Catholics,

thing and nothing. See the third volume of my last history, p. 871, where is given the synodical resolution of thanks from the Irish Hierarchy to Doctor Milner, “ particularly for his late
 “ apostolic firmness, in dissenting from, and opposing a vague
 “ indefinite declaration or resolution, pledging R. Catholics
 “ to an eventual acquiescence in arrangements possibly prejudicial to the integrity and safety of our Church discipline.” I also said, (p. 872) “ The more busy movers of the Board
 “ of Catholics of Great Britain, who from the year 1791, had
 “ openly had it in contemplation to set on foot a new national
 “ congregation” (or Church *a la Utrecht*) “ without jurisdiction flowing from the Chair of St. Peter.” In consonance with these sentiments, I mark *Columbanus’s* boast, (4 Col. 12.) *we shall yet have a national Church*; and (3 Col. 46) “ The Castabala
 “ principles are hostile to the safety of our religion, which cannot exist and keep pace with the rapid encrease of our population, unless it is supported by that canonical discipline,
 “ without which, we may transmit a vile, intriguing ultramontain, but we cannot transmit *a legal national church* to posterity.” I once more entreat his Reverence to read over and ponder on what I have further said (p. 790) on this important subject. “ They are those gentlemen,” (with some subaltern neophytes) “ who in 1791 were defeated in their attempt under
 “ the new firm of *protesting Catholic Dissenters* to throw off their
 “ spiritual subjection to the Apostolic Vicars in England.
 “ These are the gentlemen, whom the late Mr. Burke assured
 “ the author, he considered as having gone more, than half
 “ way over to Protestantism,”

tholics, who in submission to their spiritual superiors refused to take an unlawful oath, which they wished to force upon their consciences, after it had been condemned by their Bishops. As the Legislature of that day most liberally admitted the whole body of the English Catholics to the relief sought for under an oath objectionable to none, so did they necessarily conclude, that to annex conscientious difficulties, as conditions to necessary and intended benefits, would be unbecoming the dignity of the legislature, it would be to hurl amongst them the torch of dissention in lieu of presenting the olive of peace: it would be to rivet the penal code upon the necks of the bulk of the Irish Catholics for their conscientious perseverance in the faith and practice of all their Christian ancestors, whose doctrines they had known, whose conduct in conformity with them they had for centuries experienced, for the sake of liberating a set of innovators in doctrine and discipline, very much less numerous, probably less conscientious, certainly more restive to authority, and evidently more disposed to disunion and schism, than their *anti-veto* brethren. In a word, a set of *non-descripts*, whom the state neither knew nor had tried: who had been emphatically *introduced* * *to the notice of our laws, and that*

* First blue book, p. 2, circulated amongst the English Catholics in November and December, 1789, composed by Charles Butler, Esq. Secretary to the Committee, who signed it. Vide my last Hist. of Ireland, 3 Vol. p. 661 to 679.

that in a very marked and pointed manner, as a description of persons wholly unknown to them before, by the very gentleman, who had machinated and conducted the late lubricous preparatives for a *Veto* with Lords Grenville and Grey.

They re-
nounce the
Veto.

With full reflection upon all these truths, facts and circumstances, Lords Grey and Grenville, and Messrs. Ponsonby and Grattan acted like men of honor, truth, and principle, like wise and enlightened statesmen; they retracted their former opinions, when they discovered them to be unjust and unpolitical.

Cum ventum ad verum est, mores sensusque repugnant.

The nation has admired these great and good men in their places in the Senate, in their address to their Sovereign, in the face of the nation, severally acknowledging their too easy seduction into error, their utter renunciation of it, and their inflexible determination to adhere to the opposite principles of wisdom, policy, and justice. The most dignified and sublime operation of the human mind, is the public recantation of error. Never was the great and amiable Fenelon so admirable, as in publishing the condemnation of his own book (*Explication des maximes des Saints*) from the pulpit of his own cathedral. Perhaps the most estimable act of Bishop Milner's life, is his open, sincere, and unequivocal recantation of his error concerning the *Veto*. And were I even gifted with the *conscia flamma futuri*, I might with-

out

out untruth aver, that the most honourable, the most desirable, the most edifying day of your life, Rev. Doctor, will be that, on which you will solemnly and sincerely retract the errors, which are contained in your five Addresses to your Countrymen. Henceforth refrain from sheltering your splenetic and vindictive effusions against the Christian Primate under the respected names you have hitherto resorted to. They acknowledge they have been deceived by the persons, whom they trusted; they heroically retract their hasty opinions formed on misplaced and abused confidence. You therefore, Rev. and most learned Doctor, have henceforth to associate yourself with the pledged bigotry of Lord Viscount Sidmouth and his puny partizans, with the indiscriminate prostitution of Lord Viscount Castlereagh to every party, to every principle, to every spirit, to every promise, to every lure, to every job, to every plot, to every purse, (but an empty one); with the persevering intolerance of Mr. Perceval, with the affrighted and sneaking hypocrisy of the Earl of Liverpool, and their mercenary and still too numerous bands of intolerants; and more closely than ever, with the most infectious and abominable of all reptiles in Church or State, your anonymous and occult goaders and abettors, who in my last history are referred to, as having been rightly described * *mischievous and noxious creatures, seen*

2 L

no

* History of Ireland from the Union, &c. 3 Vol. p. 880. For the proofs of what I have asserted about the retractors and supporters of the Veto, I refer my readers to the late debates in

nowhere, felt everywhere. Such are your companions in arms, with whom you have arrayed yourself to keep up the ascendancy over your oppressed and proscribed country and religion. Believe me, Rev. Doctor, your countrymen have their eyes upon you; and in the indefinite variety of the revolutionary wonders of the present æra, the finding of an *O'Connor and a Catholic Priest* in such company is not the least extraordinary and revolting. They behold you pressing with senseless and indecent avidity, to the derision and disgust of your new associates for a draught of Circe's cup, with which the new leader of the host has been so powerfully drenched. You have, however, still the sympathies and wishes of many, who for the sake of your country, name, and character, devoutly pray, that the fatal beverage may not defile your lips; though none of them allow you the virtue or wisdom of Ulysses, or believe you guarded by an antidote from Mercury against the enchantment.

Circæ pocula nosti ;

*Quæ, si cum sociis stultus cupidusque bibisset,
Sub domina meretrice fuisset turpis & excors :
Vixisset canis immundus, vel amica luto sus.*

HOR. EP. 11. L. I.

You know the magic Circe's draught,
Which had the greedy fool but quaff'd,
Like his companions he had sunk
Under the lash of flaunting punk,
A sniv'ling knave, an unclean dog,
Or in foul mire delighting hog.

I set

Parliament, as reported in the several papers differing in words, all agreeing in substance.

I set out, Learned and most Rev. Doctor, with a resolution, and I hope I have continued to steer clear of theological controversy. You will however forgive me, for quoting (not from manuscripts or unpublished prologomena) my general sentiments and belief upon the fundamental subject of your five Letters, in the year 1795; that it is about fifteen years before a canvas was instituted for your promotion to the See of Elphin, during the life of the late Doctor French, and fourteen years at least before you had brought the powers and jurisdiction of the Universal Bishop and Primate of Christendom, to an equation with those of Mr. Charles Abbott; and about the like space of time before you had so rudely assailed your own Hierarchy, misrepresented their synodical acts, and traduced their characters and conduct.*

The Author's
Church and
State about
the Papal
Primacy.

“The whole doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church concerning the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome is contained in these two articles: 1°. That Christ after his resurrection to preserve the unity of his church, gave to St. Peter a superintendency and jurisdiction over his whole flock. 2°. That this office according to Christ's institution, was after St. Peter's decease to pass to his successors appointed by the Church; and that these are actually the Bishops of Rome. I have disavowed the intention of falling into controversy; I merely therefore state this doctrine; and in order to prove, that I state it fairly, and that it has

2 L 2

not

* Church and State, 536.

not been lately taken up by modern divines, nor is the mere effect of what are commonly called Papal encroachments or usurpations upon Sovereigns, I shall beg leave to remind my reader, that Saint Augustine in the fourth century, (he was born A. D. 350) expressly affirms,* that he was holden in the Catholic communion by the succession of Bishops from the See of Peter the Apostle, to whom Christ after his resurrection committed his flock, to the present episcopacy. *Tenet ab ipsâ sede Petri Apostoli, cui pascendas oves suas post resurrectionem Dominus commendavit, usque ad præsentem Episcopatum successio sacerdotum.* Now it is evident from what I have before advanced, that all the power and authority, which Christ gave to his Apostles whilst upon earth, were *purely spiritual*. None other therefore can have descended to their successors.” In that work, I laboured, and I trust not vainly, to demonstrate, that the spiritual and temporal powers cannot operate at all, but upon their respective objects; and that the light of nature suffices to discriminate between them. An adherence to these principles supersedes the necessity of noticing any part of your diffusive and petulant discussions upon the introduction of the canon law, or the controul and operation of the municipal law, upon what you very improperly term *livings*, where your religion has received no civil establishment from the state. All rights of presentation, election

OF

* Lib. Con. Epist. Fund. c. 5.

or nomination to livings or benefices are essentially bottomed on a civil establishment, and are wholly irrelevant to a clergy voluntarily supported by a contributory gospel maintenance : which though it impose on the Christian a conscientious duty, creates no civil obligation, and consequently cannot be enforced, qualified, or in any manner affected by the laws. No part of the canon law, beyond what strictly concerns submission to the revelation of Christ and conformity to *real spiritual* discipline, has, or ever had, any legal operation or effect in this or any other country, without the assent of the supreme civil magistrate, which your Reverence (as well as others) appears to consider in an ecclesiastical light, to be in this country the King, as he is called supreme head of the united Church of England and Ireland. Whereas in no sense is the supremacy of civil power vested by our constitution in the * King. The supreme and uncontrollable power of the civil magistrate is wholly vested in Parliament.

Pitiable indeed are the confusion and darkness of your ideas upon these important subjects, most learned Doctor. If these be the signs of your illuminating and reforming mission, I must again say, *Irishmen beware*: your evangelizing innovator has long since cast off his Irish prejudices, and notwithstanding the disappearance

Confusion
of Colum-
banus's
ideas.

* *Vide* Church and State *passim*, particularly 525, where the famous Atterbury controversy in the days of Queen Ann is shortly revised, which throws great light upon this subject.

disappearance of the *rouge*, I anticipate your opinions, that he ought to have been brought forth in a duller atmosphere, than that of Erin.

Beotum in crasso jurares aere natum:

HOR. I Ep. L. 11.

The man you'd swear
Was born in thick Beotian air.*

It is scarcely credible, that a person, who has read and written so much upon the subject of episcopal authority and spiritual power in general, should so unaccountably betray such ignorance and blundering in the meaning, use, and application of the terms, forms, and ceremonies of your Church. *Hallucinetur, cœcutit, labitur*. So determinately inquisitive are you into the temporal rights, which constitute the civil establishment given to the Catholic religion in different states, that all your premises are formed of usages and precedents arising out of or adapted to civil establishments, which you most illogically apply to an hierarchy, which has none: you consequently must conclude in error. You inconsistently invoke the

* What slight pretensions has Columbanus to be numbered with those, whom he calls upon to join him in traducing and opposing the Governors of the Catholic Church of Ireland! (1 Col. 24) “Is the good sense of a nation, famed for quickness
“of perception, keenness of wit, vivacity, to be cajoled by the
“hypocritical canting of men, who would dispense thralldom
“thus in bountiful profusion, and generous liberality to others,
“and reserve *independence* only for themselves?”

the protection, aid, and interference of laws, to support and improve a religion, which those very laws forbid and punish as unlawful and criminal. The partial relaxation of some of the most penal laws in favor of such individuals, as comply with the conditions thereby required, leaves every statute of that ferocious code, as to all other persons and purposes, in as full vigor, as when it first passed into a law. Not one of them is repealed. I have not been able to fix upon one fair discriminating idea in your five numbers between the acts, which proceed from the temporal and the spiritual power. What in one place you assert truly, you are sure in another to contradict, or throw into doubt.

It would be foreign from the intent of this letter, and drive me out of my province, to say any thing of the rights of the second order of the clergy to sit and judge in the synods and councils, which you have with so much heat asserted: nor shall I offer a single reflection upon your attempt to equalize the powers of the Bishop and the Priest. I have long been taught by Thomas a Kempis to venerate the mighty dignity of the Priesthood, *who enjoy a privilege denied to angels; for none but Priests, and they duly ordained by the Church, have power of saying mass or consecrating the body of Christ.* The sacerdotal power also of remitting or retaining sin, given by ordination, proves the sublime, dignified, and important functions, which Priests are ordained to perform in the Church of Christ.

Difference
between
order and
jurisdiction

Christ. But the legitimate exercise of this awful ministry depends upon jurisdiction, which you most lamentably confound with order, *

How

* Thus the most learned, the most logical, and the most theological Doctor argues, (1 Col. 36) “As the Pope has rights, which are peculiar to himself, and subordinate only to a general council, so Bishops have rights, which are equally inherent by divine institution, which it would be heretical to controvert. Even Priests, who are not in the care of souls, have *inalienable rights*, in virtue of ordination, which when once holy orders are conferred, no Bishop can without a *canonical* reason suspend or recall.” This senseless confusion of order and jurisdiction exceeds even Beotian dulness. The awful powers conferred, he received them (in St. John Lateran’s) by ordination, of uttering the words of consecration and absolution as the Minister of God, to which such supernatural effects are annexed by the divine power, can neither be recalled, nor suspended by any power upon earth with or without reason. Not so of jurisdiction, which is the legitimate authority for using or exercising those inalienable powers. If this jurisdiction have been once given with cure of souls and faculties to a Parish Priest, whether he then have immediate power over his parishioners by divine institution, or *mediante episcopo* only (a theological point I touch not) he admits he may be recalled or suspended by his Bishop for a *canonical fault*, (say gross apostasy, heresy, or flagrant habitual immorality) the Bishop has a double duty upon him independent upon the civil magistrate, first to withdraw the jurisdiction or faculties, which had been so scandalously abused, and then to provide for the spiritual wants of the parish, as a part of his diocese, over which he received the superintendence by virtue of his confirmation from the supreme head of the church. Thus when Columbanus withdrew himself from attending to the cure of the souls of Castle-

How far precisely *Columbanus cæcutit* I will not affect to decide: his optic nerves are certainly deranged: but whether strained by over eager tension in watching the anomalies of the evanescent chair of

Three first centuries without any civil establishment. None in Ireland the three last.

2 M

Elphin,

rea, the Bishop of Elphin was obliged by his episcopal duty to provide for the spiritual wants of that portion of his diocese by giving institution or spiritual jurisdiction to some other proper and fit Priest in orders, to perform these duties, which he had once instituted Columbanus to execute. On similar principles, I humbly conceive Pius VII. acted with reference to the different Sees of France, which were portions of the general flock committed to his charge; and for the spiritual wants of which he was bounden to provide. The most learned Doctor's abrogation surrender or abandonment (call his biblical vocation to Stowe what you chuse) of his flock at Castlerea, placed him in another, than his native country, without cure of souls, but with a huge and peculiarly responsible cure of books and manuscripts, and threw him under the episcopal authority of Apostolic Vicars, more immediately dependent upon the See of Rome, by being removeable at the will of his Holiness, than any ordinary Bishop of a regular hierarchy.

The conduct, manœuvres, and doctrines of Columbanus raise or refer to so many relations, analogies, or connections with material incidents set forth in my last history, that it would be unjust to the public, unfair to Ireland, and injurious to the character of the historian to pass them over unnoticed. One can hardly traverse a page of Columbanus, without being shocked at some such gross infidelity, as singly taken, would deprive an author of all credit for quotation, reference, or assertion; and yet he has the hardihood to declare (5 Col. 492) "*I now declare, that I have in this, as in my former works most religiously adhered to truth!!!*" His fourth number is professed to be a re-

Elphin, or cracked by too close approximation to the unextinguishable light of the Chair of Peter, is doubtful

futation of Doctor Poynter's theological examination of the doctrine of Columbanus. (4 Col. 7) "I give," says he, "Doctor Poynter credit for the candor of his assertion, that *no proposition in my works can be pointed out as heretical or schismatical.*" This acknowledgment leaves me in possession of my orthodoxy, and exposes the rashness of him, who talked so wisely of retractation and excommunication." Now I confidently assert, that not one man out of five millions reading this passage, would not suppose, that Doctor Poynter had actually made the assertion, upon which Columbanus so exultingly rests his claim to orthodoxy. Perhaps not five out of the five millions would think it necessary, as I did, who knew the Arian lubricity, the Jansenian dissimulation, the Columbanian impudence of the writer, to refer to Doctor Poynter's examination, slight as it is, to verify the quotation. *Doctor Poynter has made no such assertion.* His *brochure* consists only of forty-four loosely printed pages in octavo. A fair trial of Columbanus upon the charge of impudent misquotation will be completed by comparison in fewer minutes, than Doctor Poynter probably consumed days in making the theological examination of his doctrine. What he really says, p. 6, in his introduction, is lamentably too true; and draws upon the head of Columbanus consequences, which fatally commit him before his countrymen, his hierarchy, and his God. "On the subject in question, Columbanus assumes so many different shapes, that it is difficult to lay hold of any particular proposition, and say, that *this is his precise doctrine.*" In this Doctor Poynter was right; for there is hardly a proposition hazarded in one part of his works, that is not varied, qualified, or contradicted in another. In the same page 6, Doctor Pointer says, "I have read these three letters of Columbanus with attention, and I do not hesitate to declare, that they

doubtful. He scarcely distinguishes a point in the whole line of demarcation between the spiritual and

2 M 2

temporal

“ contain a *misrepresentation*, rather than a true statement of
 “ many points of the doctrine and discipline of the Catholic
 “ Church. His doctrine concerning the spiritual jurisdiction
 “ of Bishops, and the difference between a Bishop and a Priest
 “ I maintain is erroneous and subversive of the hierarchy of
 “ the Catholic Church. His work is calculated to produce ob-
 “ scure notions, and to leave false opinions in the minds of the
 “ generality of his readers.”

This *forged* false assertion put into the mouth of Dr. Poynter leads to matter and results big with the fate of religion in these islands. The subject, under all existing circumstances, is too vast for my attempt in this letter to place it before my reader in full detail; it is too awful to be treated lightly or ludicrously; it calls too powerfully upon the Catholic individual, for a practical test of submission to his legitimate spiritual superior, not to force from me, circumstanced as I stand, an explicit and determined avowal of my opinions, impressions and obligations arising out of it. I do it under correction, and with respectful deference for, and full submission to the legitimate episcopal jurisdiction of Doctor Poynter over all the Catholics of the London district. I collect from p. 27, 4 Col., and from p. 15, 5 Col. and from several mysterious insinuations, twilight presumptions, and feeling hints dispersed through the five numbers, that Doctor Milner has directed all the Priests within his (the midland) district not to admit Doctor O'Connor to the sacred tribunal of confession, until he shall have made a public recantation of the doctrines, which he has published, to the scandal and danger of his flock; that the late Bishop Douglass had withdrawn or suspended his spiritual faculties, or prohibited him to administer the sacraments to others within the London district on account of those doctrines. Now without

temporal power. He cannot discover the two leading phenomena in ecclesiastical history ; the growth of

arrogating to myself the faintest shade of right to review or question their judgment and conduct in this particular, I am free to express my cordial conviction of the imperious necessity for their having acted at least as far as they did go. In the London district Doctor O'Connor was allowed notwithstanding to officiate at the altar, to preach and teach, (though restrained from administering the sacraments). Many serious and sincere Catholics are perplexed at the revolting consideration, that the public and persevering propagation of false and scandalous doctrine by a Priest should draw upon him the suspension or deprivation of spiritual faculties by his Bishop, who still authorized him to preach and teach, (the most obvious mode of propagating error) and to offer up the most solemn sacrifice for the people seduced, scandalized, or put in danger by the broaching of the pernicious errors, which occasioned the necessity of the suspension or interdict.

Doctor Poynter has now succeeded to the episcopal charge of the London district, and upon a theological examination of the doctrine of Columbanus has within these two years declared in print, for the instruction and edification of his flock, that Columbanus's letters contain *misrepresentation of many points of Catholic doctrines and discipline of the Catholic Church ; that his doctrine upon the spiritual jurisdiction of Bishops, and the difference between a Bishop and a Priest is erroneous, and subversive of the hierarchy of the Catholic church ; and that his work is calculated to produce obscure notions, and to leave false opinions in the minds of the generality of his readers ; it is therefore the confident expectation of those, who look up to his pastoral vigilance and care for his flock, " That we henceforth be no more children " tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by " the slight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait*

of Catholicity throughout the world for the three first centuries of the Christian Æra without any *civil* establishment, in defiance of the law and civil magistrate: and the maintenance and support of a Catholic Hierarchy and religion in his own country, for the last three centuries, without any *civil* establishment

“to deceive.” (*Ephes. IV.14.*) That for strengthening their submission and obedience to their legitimate teachers, and keeping them united with the head and center of the church, he will either retract his own opinion and judgment of the doctrine of Columbanus, or call upon Columbanus to retract those erroneous and dangerous doctrines, which Doctor Poynter has so explicitly declared to be subversive of the Catholic Hierarchy, and calculated to leave false opinions in the minds of the generality of his readers. It is the firm and just expectation of all orthodox Christians, that a Minister of God’s word shall not be licensed to preach and teach unsound and seducing doctrines from the altar and pulpit, under the imposing authority of *divine mission*, who stands publicly denounced by his Bishop of propagating them in his book through the uncontrollable freedom of the British press. They behold with horror the ravages already made by their most subtle and pernicious of all heresies in the plebeian, in the patrician, in the sacerdotal orders. They confidently anticipate in the fulfillment and indefectibility of God’s promise to his church, that he will graciously manifest his extraordinary mercy to this portion of it, in preserving it from modern *Arianism* by *Athanasian* firmness.

Si fractus illabatur orbis

Impavidum ferient ruinæ.

HORACE, 3 L. 3 O.

Dauntless he’ll stand amid the crash of all,

Whilst harmless on his head the fragments fall.

blishment, against the municipal laws, in spite of the civil magistrate, and in defiance of unrelenting oppression and persecution. He sees not a single feature of his religion, but through the fallacious *medium* of *civil establishments*. To a person so voraciously addicted to them as Columbanus is, every part of the ecclesiastical system, which is unaffected by them, must have, if any, a black jaundiced appearance. The practises of all the dispersed churches for the three first centuries, and those of the Irish Catholic church in the three last, would to an undistempered eye have operated as a prism, to reduce and annalize the imposing glare, by representing each object in its genuine primæval colouring.

Protestants
and Catholics
lies equally
distinguish
the two
powers.

If your theology suffice not, Rev. Doctor, to restore your sight, a sincere application to the law, to which you so pathetically appeal * (*Is the responsibility of law never to be known in that church?*) will enable you to discover objects at least, though it may not powerfully dispose you to follow the very light it gives. You have then yet practically to learn from the laws of England,† that even in the reformed system of a *national church*, which you so devoutly sigh for,

* 1 Col. 24.

† As a lawyer I make free to remind my readers in general, to inform the most learned Dr. that the laws of England, which affected the civil establishment of religion before the Reformation were bottomed upon, and framed to support and effectuate the then admitted spiritual prerogatives and rights of his Holiness.

for, *we shall yet have a national church*,† in the appointment both of the higher and lower clergy, the act

ness, who upon that principle was by emphatic eminence styled *the Apostle*. Upon this subject widely did our ancestors differ from Columbanus and his occult and overt leaders, employers, instigators, and co-operators. He says, (1 Col. 80) “neither the *election* of Bishops by the Pope, nor their *confirmation* by him after election, nor their *nomination* to any vacant See, nor the Pope’s *consent*, nor even his *knowledge* of the appointment is a necessary requisite to establish the validity of any of these acts.” By the case of the Bishop of Salisbury in the year books (the very best evidence of what our old common law was) (41 Edward III. A. D. 1369) it appears, that by the common law of the land an English Bishop elected under a *congè d’elire*, consecrated, or even invested with the temporalities by the King was not a complete Bishop, till he were confirmed by the Pope: for this *confirmation* was the act, by which he received his Spiritual jurisdiction or mission. “Allbeit he be elected, it behoveth him to be confirmed by the Pope, and it may be, that the Pope may refuse him for non ability or otherwise &c. *Car tout soit il eslie il convient estre confirm del Pape, et poit estre que le Pape luy voet refuser pour non abilitie ou autrement.*” On the other hand our ancestors never considered, that the Pope gave any *temporality* whatever by confirming or appointing a Bishop, as Columbanus has with malign hebetude argued, and urged throughout his different numbers. In an older case in the year books (31 Edw. III) it is said, that, “even after election and *Confirmation* the freehold of the temporalites was not in the Bishop, till after he had sued for them out of the King’s hands. And in order to make manifest to the existing and all future generations the belief and practice of

* 4 Col. 12.

conferring the spiritual power is as distinctly and substantially kept a part from all the civil acts attending

our ancestors, as to the exclusive, eminent and uncontrollable right of the Pope to name and appoint Bishops and give them mission or Spiritual jurisdiction, I direct their attention to Pope Clement V., who in the days of our Edward II, (he began his reign A. D. 1307) rejected *Thomas Cobham* chosen by *Congé délire* to the See of Canterbury, who went to Avignon according to the custom of those days to be confirmed and invested by the Pope, and his Holyness appointing *at his own motion and discretion Thomas Reynolds* to that See, to whom he sent both the investiture and pall. No act whatever of the Civil Magistrate ensued this instance of the Pope's exercising his supreme right of appointing Bishops to every part of the Church unconditionally and independently of the Civil Magistrate. Whereas had the King, Parliament, or Chapter, or any species of patron named, elected, appointed, or even invested a Bishop, our ancestors held (and so do their *genuine Catholic* successors) that the *confirmation* must have been made by the Pope : for *confirmation* imports the supremacy or transcendancy of that power, by virtue of which the inchoate original act is done. (Chu. & St. 420. 484) Irishmen ! Englishmen ! Catholics of every Clime ! beware ! Let no man say of you, that the time is come, when you will not endure sound doctrine : but after your own lusts you heap to yourselves teachers having itching ears. Beleive no man ; no graduated prig of theology, no conceited member of a foreign academy, no thrown out mitre hunter at home, though he swear to you, that the common law of England, (that masterpiece of human wisdom) is formed out of or bottomed upon any thing, like bigotry, mummary or priestcraft, or papal pride, insolence, arrogance, assumption, couvetousness, encroachment, usurpation, or tyranny, or popular ignorance, or servility, cor-

ing the initiation of the human being into apostolic mission, or the legitimate exercise of his (unalienable)

2 N

ble)

ruption, superstition or brutality. No; your common law arose out of the creed of our christian ancestors, who from their adoption of christianity continued uninterruptedly to acknowledge an efficient primacy of dignity and jurisdiction in Christ's Vicar on earth, the Bishop of Rome. For untill the despotic Henry for his own lustful and ambitious purposes had bullied the two houses of his servile Parliament to alter the common law in this regard, by withdrawing from the Supreme Pastor every particle of that *Civil establishment* of the Catholic Religion, which the piety, confidence and reverence of our ancestors for the common Pastor of the faithful had invested his Holiness with, as corresponding with and depending upon that Cardinal or top-link of the Spiritual chain, by which thro' every gradation of Church government they communed with the head and center of Christ's visible church on earth, and were connected with its invisible head in Heaven, no alteration in this regard was ever thought of or attempted. Indeed *true* and *genuine* Catholics believe (and in this they agree with *Protestants of the Establishment*), that the *power of the keys* was originally given by Christ and must for ever remain, as long as the Sun and Moon endure, *independent of the civil magistrates*. The sympathetic motives of vice or turpitude, the unworthy grounds of servile acquiescence, or the plausible vizard of courtly approbation produced the concurrence of the majority with the will of a depraved and debased tyrant. But Irishmen in particular, I again (though an Englishman) say to you, BEWARE. You, who for three centuries of unrelenting persecution, of corrupt lure, and debased oppression, have with inflexible nerve and vigor kept your hold of the *cardinal link*, loose it not for the fascination, fooleries, and falshoods of a man, who seldom tells truth, but when he wishes, or expects to be discredited, or would be benefitted by disbelief: as when (2

ble) powers, as in the Roman Catholic church. The church of England or Ireland (i. e. the *national church*) cutting, like Alexander, the Gordian knot, lopps off the top-link of the chain, by which Roman Catholics have from time immemorial considered the Hierarchy or Church Government in regular gradation, connected from the Parish Priest and his curate, through the universal Primate as vicar upon earth, with Christ the divine founder and head of it, in Heaven.

Nature of
the acts of
collation
of spiritual
power.

All the preliminaries, concomitants, and consequents of this awful collation of spiritual jurisdiction, or Apostolic mission, wherever there is a civil establishment given to the Catholic religion, are by you, most Rev. Doctor, confusedly heaped together without discrimination, misconceived and misrepresented, insidiously diversified, or ignorantly identified. Election by the laity, or under the writ of *conge d'elire* by Dean and Chapter, nomination by royal patent, postulation by the suffragans of a province, or the clergy of a diocese, presentation by ecclesiastical or civil corporations, or lay personages, or any possible mode, by which a civil magistrate or community of Christians may express or convey to the supreme Bishop the best founded presumption of the worthiness

Col. 37) he spoke the real truth, in order, that his deceived followers might think it an exaggerated falsehood. “There are, “who for their own purposes, will devoutly assert, that the “writer is a *schismatic*, perhaps an occult *heretic*, a *degenerate* “O’Conor, an *Englishman* in his heart.”

worthiness and fitness of the person, upon whom his Holiness should (for he only can, whilst no œcumenical council is actually sitting) confer the spiritual cure and superintendence of a particular diocese, are by you spoken of and treated, as immutable discipline, binding the particular dioceses and provinces, and controlling the eminent right of the living head of the church upon earth, to dispense spiritual jurisdiction throughout every part of it, until the end of time. Each of these preliminaries proceeding from the temporal power of the civil magistrate, must like all temporal institutions, be essentially variable, and unceasingly liable to be adapted to the indefinite variety of all possible human events and exigencies. Equally evident is it, that the induction with the lower clergy, and the homage done to the King by the Bishop, his instalment or enthroning, as it is sometimes called, or the delivery of the ring and crozier, or any other ceremony subsequent to the act of institution or confirmation (which is the act collating mission or spiritual jurisdiction) or any other act, form or ceremony tending to notify the person invested with spiritual jurisdiction, to whom spiritual submission is due, as well as tithes or other temporalities, wherever there is a civil establishment, are *civil* acts, and are of course changeable by the civil magistrate, without whose concurrence or sanction they can have no binding or legal effect at all. It is an unexceptionable maxim, that the real spiritual power left by Christ

to teach and govern his church, cannot *proprio vigore* produce any civil effect whatever. When therefore in the established Protestant, or as your Reverence would call it, the *National Church*, a Bishop of a particular diocese institutes a Clerk, Rector, or Vicar of a Parish within his Diocese, or the Archbishop of a Province (or three other Bishops during the vacancy of the Arch-Episcopal See) confirms or appoints the elected or Patentee, the civil magistrate interferes not in the act, which is admitted to be an exercise of divine right, flowing from *the power of the keys*. Why therefore did your Reverence take it in such high dudgeon, that Bishop Milner should have told you “that
 “ you might as well pretend to pluck a beam from
 “ the Sun, as to touch one *fibre* of ecclesiastical juris-
 “ diction.” Every well-informed Protestant will now (these matters have been latterly better understood than heretofore) tell you, as strongly, that neither the Sovereign nor Parliament set up any pretensions to give, take away, or qualify (according to the words of their episcopal commissions) *those things which are known from holy Scriptures to belong to you by divine right*; and that the frequently repeated exception, *in quantum per Christi leges licet*, was a constant and unequivocal admission of the existence of a *spiritual* or *Apostolical power*, and an absolute renunciation of any right in the civil magistrate to interfere with it. In a word, it is solemn Protestant
 English

English, and legal authority, * (therefore good against you) that the established national church admits

* See a note upon this subject in 2d Vol. History of Ireland since the Union, p. 101. “No Monarch ever pretended, or ever was allowed to have in him, or to exercise the power of the keys, or to partake of the pontifical or Episcopal order. (Notwithstanding Sir E. Coke’s pedantic nonsense, in spiritualising the Lords annointed, *Reges sacro oleo uncti, sunt spiritualis jurisdictionis capaces.*) He cannot therefore confirm a Bishop or institute a Clergyman. That being the act, by which Spiritual jurisdiction is conferred: it cannot, nor ever was pretended to be drawn from the Civil Magistrate. Order and jurisdiction are essentially different: they are both necessary for church government: but neither can be drawn from the Civil Magistrate. The act of Henry VIII, which regulates the ordination of Priests and consecration of Bishops, gives to the crown a right of punishing the metropolitan with a *præmunire* in case after the election under the *Congé d’Elire*, he neglect or refuse to consecrate and confirm the Bishop elect: but it enables not the crown to do what the metropolitan might have done, but refused or neglected to do: viz. to collate *Spiritual jurisdiction* over the diocese: that flowing from the *power of the keys* could not be granted by the Civil Magistrate. Whereas by the same act, if the Dean and Chapter refuse or neglect to elect a person under the *Congé d’Elere*, (which is a Civil Act) the King is by that Statute enabled by letters patent to appoint a person to be presented to the Metropolitan. So in the inferior Clergy; the clergyman is presented by the patron, to be instituted by his Bishop, who alone can confer Spiritual jurisdiction and the cure of souls over any part of his diocese. The only difference between the Catholic and Protestant in this point is: the former holds it necessary to

mits the existence of a pure spiritual power, which consists in the *power of the keys, potestas clavium*; which are divine rights invested in Christian Bishops, *quæ ex scripturis, tibi divinitus commissa esse dignoscuntur*, and which cannot be usurped or even touched by human legislation, only *quantum per Christi leges licet*.

Confusion
of Colum-
banus upon
the subject.

Hallucinatur, cæcutit, labitur. The fitness of this motto to your Reverence's confused aberrations, contradictions and false assumptions, recurs almost in every page. To follow them in minute detail would be irksome to my readers, and useless to most of yours. You are perpetually mistating, confounding, and misapplying the words, *making, naming, appointing, consecrating, ordaining, confirming, instituting, church, government, mission, jurisdiction, authority, rights, liberties, privilege, livings, benefices, patronage, establishments, civil, temporal, human, spiritual, ecclesiastical, sacerdotal, lawful, legitimate, prescriptive, inalienable, legal, and canonical*, as applicable to Church, Bishops, Priests, and States. If ambitious of singularity, you have certainly attained that object. *Nil æquale homini fuit illi.* You wish to be thought orthodox, you wish to appear heterodox: you affect submission, and arrogance to the same authority: you profess love and respect for your country, and strain even at eloquence, to traduce and vilify her. You fastidiously enlist under the banners of truth, and with

“derive *Spiritual jurisdiction* from the universal Bishop.” The latter from a Metropolitan,

with studied perfidy desert them in action : you coldly profess truths in words, which you warmly renounce by inference and implication : you boldly labour to inculcate false doctrine, and timidly submit to the true : you oil and soap over your propositions, in the pitiful confidence of eluding the gripe of your antagonist : you play the Norman, like Blanchard :* You have not said, the Pope is the sole source of spiritual jurisdiction or mission throughout the whole church of Christ, whilst no œcumenical council is sitting : and you have refused to say on the other hand, that spiritual jurisdiction or mission, can originate from any other source. I have endeavoured to shew, I hope successfully, that your Reverence, though in orders, and a most learned Doctor, have not been warranted in your assertions and charges against your cotemporaries and opponents, that you have been false in your history, inaccurate in your chronology, incorrect in your translations, maliciously unfaithful in your quotations, knowingly deceptive in your misrepresentations, and perpetually at variance with yourself in boast, failure, and contradiction. *Nil fuit unquam sic impar sibi.* It remains for me to expose your powers of ratiocination. And I am free to anticipate my reader's conclusion ; that they would disgrace the threshold of dialecticks.

Irishmen beware! Your reforming Evangelist opens his mission with a cavalier anticipated pros-
 tration of all his opponents, *exultavit ut gigas.* †“Take
 the

His further
 extra-
 gancies on
 the subject.

* Anteap. † 1 Col. 103.

“ the following few principles, in opposition to all
 “ the declamatory nonsense of your *Keoghs*, and all
 “ the half-measures, and political manœuvrings of
 “ our *clerical* politicians, and it is impossible you
 “ can err.” *Irishmen beware* in following this uner-
 ring guide. He tells you some truths : but his de-
 sign in telling them, is that he may seduce you into
 error. The support of ninety-nine truths will not
 justify the maintenance of one false opinion upon
 faith and church government. He asserts truly, that,
 * “ without a mission from the Church there can be
 “ no ecclesiastical *jurisdiction*, no valid administra-
 “ tion of the sacraments.” But he is silent, as to the
 mode of deriving it from *the Church* ;† he explains
 not

* Col. 105.

† The studid craft, by which Columbanus has throughout
 his five numbers evaded any proposition, which either asserts
 or denies, that Spiritual jurisdiction is to be derived from the
 Pope, is a marked symptom of the Jansenian School. Affec-
 tation and boast of general respect and docility to the church;
 contempt and opposition to its governors. Cant upon specu-
 lative obedience : contumacy against practical submission. I
 can assimilate this *altum silentium* about the real source and
 practical mode of deriving Spiritual jurisdiction to nothing,
 but the *Calvino-Jansenian* doctrines of *Richer* and that School,
 of which more is said in the the Appendix No. III. The
 noted Calvinist Ann du Bourg, who was put to death under
 Henry III, gave in his *formula fidei* upon this point ; that he
 believed the power of loosing and binding, commonly
 called the *power of the keys*, to have been given by God, *not to*
one man, or two, but to the whole church, that is to all the faithful

not what he means by *the Church* in that proposition :
but confusedly imports a concurrence of the *civil*
2 O magistrate

and those, who beleive in Christ." Something has been already said of Columbanus' favourable representation of Jansenism : and more will be said upon that prolific source of evil in the modern church in the Appendix No. III. It is not however immaterial to the denouement of the piece, that has been secretly getting up for the British Theatre for more than twenty years, to shew how leniently, how artfully, and how plausibly the subject, the plot, the heroes, the soubrets, the mechanism, the scenes, the interludes are managed at rehearsals, to conceal the catastrophe until the day of exhibition. A much more elegant writer than Columbanus published in 1793 the memoirs of *Gregorio Panzani*, (the Rev. Jos. Berrington) in the supplement to which (p. 39) he ushers in this very important subject with the lines from Milton. Par. Lost. b. 2.

Others apart sat on a hill retir'd
In thoughts more elevate, and reason'd
High of providence, foreknowledge, will and fate :
Fix'd fate, freewill, foreknowledge absolute :
And found no end, in wand'ring mazes lost.

" The history of this controversy, is the history truly of the *egarements de l'esprit humain*, which under the specious shew of supporting the integrity of religion and the cause of truth, all the passions, to which man is subject, rushed into action, and raged unbridled. The Jesuits in this warfare were the champions of *free will*, against the doctrines of Jansenius ; while other orders on the side of *Grace*, but not on the side of the Belgian Bishop (i e Jansens Bishop of Ipres), whom the decrees of Rome had anathematized, and combated with equal ardour. But the controversy, as it advanced, branched out widely, taking different aspects, and involving various matter. He at first was a Jansenist, who admitted the real doctrines

magistrate in the act of mission or jurisdiction ; “ and
 “ without the good understanding of the *civil power*,
 there

of the Sect: then he, who refused to subscribe *unconditionally* to the orders of Rome: he, who appealed from those decrees to a general council: he, who rejecting the doctrines, maintained, that they were not to be found in the Volume *Augustinus*: he, who wished to remain passive on the question: he, who could believe, that a Jansenist could be an honest man: he, that did not admire all the maxims and manœuvres of the Jesuits: he in fine, who was not a friend to their order.” In p. 443, this Reverend gentleman represents “Quesnell a man of many virtues and of great learning, was an honest *Jansenist*, who died in 1719, anathematized by Rome and persecuted for the excrescences of a wild imagination by Kings, Priests and Jesuits.” A truly *Richerian sentiment* !!! In p. 400, he details some charges sent to Rome against certain Missionary Priests from England in 1707, who instructed their converts,” to speak irreverently of the Pope, of the invocation of Saints and of indulgences: that many kept in their oratories the portraits of *Arnault* and *St. Cyran* (noted French Jansenists): that many books, either plainly Jansenistical, or nearly so, had within the last years been translated from the French, and printed: that a certain Priest in the county of Durham instructing some scholars, read to them the *provinciul letters, &c.*” To which Mr. Berrington adds the following note.*

* The letters of the virtuous and eminent Pascal, *Sur la morale & la politique des Jesuites*? He then gives a flattering Critique upon them, to which he subjoins the following eulogy of his own. “He that has read these famous letters, will subscribe to the Critique: he, that has not read them, has lost a pleasure, which their perusal only can compensate.” They were revised and corrected by Arnault and Nicole. I should also be wanting in duty and attention to my readers, were I not to apprize them, that they were solemnly condemned at Rome, and by the council of State, and

“there must be war between the Church and the
 “State.” It must be presumed, that your Reverence
 here meant the ecclesiastical state of the national
 clergy, where they had a *civil* establishment; for no
 ingenuity can torture the words into a reference to
 the great body of Christ’s church dispersed over the
 whole earth, its supreme head, and the civil magis-
 trate of Ireland. You then advance some more
 truth, but mix it up with a huge portion of falsehood.
 * “No Englishman ever yet for a moment supposed,
 “that the King could administer sacraments, ordain
 “Priests, *give a mission for preaching or teaching, or*
 “*be the source of spiritual as well as of temporal power.*
 “They give him no authority even in church disci-
 “pline, but such as is necessary for maintaining or-
 “der in the State.” The plain truth is, that the
 great bulk of English Protestants, as well as Irish,
 have for these two last centuries supposed, that all ec-
 clesiastical or spiritual jurisdiction whatever proceed-
 ed from our King, as the supreme head of the estab-
 lished church.

Few, very few persons indeed have heretefore
 thought fairly upon this subject, as did formerly
 Bramhall, Archbishop of Armagh; Carlton, Bishop
 of Chichester; and latterly Lord Grenville, who
 truly informed the House of Lords in 1810, what

Erroneous
 ideas of
 English-
 men con-
 cerning the
 supremacy
 of the King.

2 O 2

was

* 1. Col. 91.

several Bishops and Parliaments in France. The reader is requested to
 apply these passages to the touch stone, by which in the appendix No. III,
 he is instructed how to discover a Jansenist.

was new to most of them, that the King was not Pope of the established church. Upon that general error on the subject of the King's supremacy was formed that oath of supremacy, which Lord Grenville justly observed * *appeared to have been framed with a captious desire to exclude Catholics. An oath might, be conceived, be framed freed from that captiousness, acknowledging the temporal supremacy.* Under that error were made out the commissions of Cranmer, Bonner, and the first Protestant Bishops.† Under it was framed

* Vid. 3 Vol. of Hist. of Ireland since the Union p. 689.

† Of that act Heylin, a respectable Protestant Historian and Divine said. "The intent of the contrivers of this act was to weaken the authority of the Episcopal order, by forcing them from their strong hold of Divine institution, and making them no other, than the King's ministers only. And of this act, such use was made, that those Bishops of those times were not in a capacity of conferring orders, but as they were thereunto empowered by special licence." And the great Protestant historian Bishop Burnet in his history of the Reformation (part II. p. 6) says, "The Bishops were required to take out commissions of the same form with those, they had taken out in King Henry's time. Cranmer set an example to the rest, and took out his commission." The same historian speaking of Bonner's Commission says, (Coll. to 1st part No. XIV) "The substance of it is, that as all jurisdictions both ecclesiastical and civil flow from the King, as Supreme head, and he was the foundation of all power, and it became those, who exercised it only (*precario*) at the King's courtesie, gratefully to acknowledge, that they had it only of his bounty: and

framed the Act of Edward VI. concerning the election of Bishops. Under the evident confusion of this error did the Legislators act in the first of Elizabeth, when they put an end to the Pope's spiritual and ecclesiastical power from the last day of that session, and
 "all such jurisdiction, privileges, superiorities, and
 "pre-eminences spiritual and ecclesiastical, as by
 "any spiritual or ecclesiastical power or authority
 (evidently of the Pope, which was only to cease on the last day of the Session) "hath heretofore been or
 "may lawfully be exercised or used for the visita-
 "tion of the ecclesiastical state or persons, and for
 "reformation, order, and correction of the same and
 "of all manner of heresies, schisms, abuses, offences,
 "contempts, and enormities, thereby united and annexed

"to declare, that they would deliver it up again, when it
 "should please him to call for it. And since the King had
 "constituted the Lord Cromwell his Vice-gerent in *ecclesiastical*
 "affairs, yet because he could not look into all those matters,
 "therefore the King upon Bonner's petition did empower him
 "in his own stead to ordain such, as he found worthy to
 "present; and give *institution* with all parts of *Episcopal* authority, for which he is duly commissioned, and this to last
 "during the King's pleasure only." Of these commissions Collyer says, (Ch. Hist. Pt. II. l. 111. p. 169) "After the
 "King has thus declared himself Patriarch in his dominions,
 "claimed all manner of *Spiritual* authority, and pronounced
 "the Bishops no more than his delegates at pleasure; after
 "this, these words are thrown into the commission to give it
 "the more passable complection, *besides those things, which are*
 "known from holy Scriptures to belong to you of divine right."

“nexed to the Imperial Crown of this realm. Her Majesty was moreover empowered, “to appoint commissioners to exercise, use, occupy, and execute, “under her, all manner of jurisdictions, privileges, “and pre-eminences in any wise touching or concerning spiritual or ecclesiastical jurisdiction. And “to visit, reform, redress, order, correct, and amend “all such heresies, schisms, abuses, offences, contempts and enormities whatever.” The next year after this act had passed, a great part of the nation believing the truth of what Doctor Milner told you, *that they might as well attempt to pluck a beam from the Sun, as to touch one fibre of ecclesiastical jurisdiction*, the Queen was advised to publish what was called her *præ-monition*: a most tyrannical act, to force an unnatural and distorted meaning upon the simplest words of a statute, and to declare fractious and turbulent, those who should refuse to take the oath of supremacy in this tortured sense of her claiming no spiritual jurisdiction. “Her Majesty forbiddeth “all manner her subjects to give ear or credit, to “such perverse and malicious persons, (i. e. the recusants) “which most sinisterly and maliciously labour to notify to her loving subjects, how by the “words of the said oath it may be collected, that the “Kings or Queens of this realm, possessors of the “Crown, may challenge authority and power of ministry of divine offices in the church.” She claimed no other authority or power, than what her father and brother

brother claimed and enjoyed. This left the difficulty untouched as to those, who could see no better title in her father and brother, *jure coronæ*, than in herself, to partake of the *power of the keys*. Under this identical error did the pedantic Cooke ascribe this Apostolic attribute to the holy chrism used at the coronation: and the greatest part of the learned professions of the law and theology, have generally considered and described the Sovereign as *persona mixta*. It is morally impossible, most learned Doctor, that the pursuits and studies of your life and profession could have left you ignorant of these facts and circumstances. What then must be your effrontery in asserting, that *no Englishman ever yet for a moment supposed, that the King could give mission for preaching or teaching, or be the source of spiritual, as well as temporal power*. You have the general error of two centuries, the voice of several Legislatures, the declarations of Sovereigns, the doctrines of lawyers and theologians, and the *communis opinio* not only of the Clergy, but of the Laity, to falsify your assertion. *Multitudo errantium not tollit errorem*. The assumption was not less erroneous, because general. Against such an inundation of evidence, incredible is the hardihood of your assertion. But yet the man, who has *washed of the rouge*, who has once transgressed the bounds of common decency, becomes in self-defence a *thorough-paced bravo*. *Sed tamen qui semel verecundiæ*

verecundiæ fines transierit, eum bene & et naviter oportet esse impudentem.

Indepen-
dent power
of the keys
admitted
by the Bri-
tish Civil
Magistrate.

I wish not, most learned Doctor, to follow your example in leading any of your countrymen astray. *Irishmen beware.* There may appear incongruity in my citing the authority of a whole nation generally for two centuries holding opinions, which you *bene et naviter* insist *no Englishman ever for a moment did*; more especially, when I contend for the force and operation of the laws being contrary to that general stream of opinion. I certainly have said, and I again repeat, that the *salvo, quantum per Christi leges licet* introduced into the act of convocation or submission of the Clergy, and the exception of what, from the scriptures the Bishops are known to have of divine right, upon which the several Acts of Parliament were founded, which expressed or affected to extinguish the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome over the realm, recognized the existence of a spiritual power amongst Christians, *postestas clavium*, essentially differing from the *potestas gladii*, independent upon each other; as it is fully and fairly set forth in the declaration of the Bishops and principal Clergy under Henry VIII. Now the admission of this principle negatives the Legislature's *power of touching one fibre of ecclesiastical jurisdiction*. When therefore *ex abundanti cautela* they used these exceptions and salvos, it was no more than a useless declaration, that the
power

power of the keys was beyond their competency to touch. Whoever believed the scriptures, knew the futility of the declaration. Yet few at that day, or since, have sufficiently discriminated (your Reverence evidently has not) between religion and the *civil establishment* of it. This confused error was kept up and acted upon by the lust and ambition of Henry, by the despotism of Elizabeth, the pedantry of James, the arbitrariness of the other Stuarts, and the interest of their successors. Therefore do we constantly see rights claimed and acts done by our Sovereign, which are exclusively out of the competency of the civil magistrate; such as judging of the Christian revelation, determining upon heresy and schism, granting spiritual jurisdiction or mission, and controlling the exercise of it in those, to whom, *divinitus commissa esse dignoscuntur*. At all times there were men sufficiently enlightened to see, and sufficiently honest to declare the truth. More recently than those Protestant Divines I have already mentioned, has Lesley* said, "How can rights, that are *divine* be
 2 P given

* Pref. to the *Regale and Pontificale* VII. In order, that Columbanus may not always upbraid me for gagging in the same note with the foreign influence men, I mention, that the late respectable Mr. Whitaker, Rector of Ruan Lanyhorne has assured me more than once, that he considered Lesley to be the greatest man, that has enlightened christendom since St. Paul. I have said in my Church and State (p. 581) although differing from Mr. Whitaker upon some political principles; that "his publication (*The real origin of Govern-*

“given up? And if they are *divine*, no *human* authority can supersede or limit them.” Your Reverence has admitted the truth of these doctrines, in order to obtrude insidiously upon your less discerning and considerate readers a gross and mischievous falsehood. “Here then are the necessary requisites *jure divino* for Bishops and Priests: Canonical Election, Canonical Ordination, and Canonical mission, and these must be independent of the civil power.” *Irishmen beware!* and mark the reasoning of your new Evangelist. No other human being saving your most learned Reverence, will I confide, call in question the truism of Lesley. What is of divine institution, is independent of the civil power, and therefore indispensable, immutable, and impervious to the lapse of time, vicissitude of fortune, and fluctuation of human occurrences. Every right, power, and obligation left to, or imposed upon the Church by its divine founder, are common to all and every part of it; the Church knows no partial precepts, no variable doctrines, no national ordinances. The kingdom, which Christ established on earth, though not of this world, comprises every habitation of man: it has no limits, no sections, no divisions. What God made universal, cannot be restricted by man’s presumption: what in his infinite wisdom he ordained

“ment) “bespeaks a man of great erudition, a very brilliant mind, and a warm wish to serve his country.” I wish I could with truth assert the same of Columbanus.

ordained cannot be improved by human legislators. They, whom the Creator has made his Ministers, cannot be controuled by the creature.

In order to prove, that canonical election is a *jure* Election & institution, *divino* requisite for a Catholic Bishop, your Reverence very flippantly asserts upon your own authority, order and jurisdiction, without offering either proof or reason for the assertion, * that “ *all Catholic Bishops must be canonically elected by the Catholic Clergy of the vacant diocese.*” This you think quite sufficient to prove your *thesis*. Upon the two other divine rights of episcopacy, viz. *order* and *jurisdiction*, of which no well informed Christian doubted, you have condescended to offer some sort of reasoning: though lamentably sophistical and false. 2°. “ *They must have canonical ordination from the Catholic Church.*” To prove this universal proposition, you particularize, *that they must be ordained by three Catholic prelates with the consent of the provincial Metropolitans*. Whereas I presume, the head of the Church, or any Archbishop or Bishop, by commission (perhaps validly without it) may consecrate a Bishop, or confer the order of episcopacy. You then say truly, that * “ *Ordination alone does not imply jurisdiction. It only gives the ordained an aptitude to serve the Church by preaching, teaching, and administering sacraments; but it does not allot to him a particular altar, or congregation. For this he must await the mission of the Church, which is to indicate to him the par-*

2 P 2

“ ticular

* 1 Col. 105.

“ ticular destination, whether to Ireland, to England,
 “ or to America, &c. *Quomodo prædicabunt, nisi mit-*
 “ *tantur.*” In the particular instance, which you have
 alledged of the ordination of an Irish Bishop, and
 which you falsely assume, *must* be by three suffra-
 gans, with the consent of the Primate, (because he
 may be otherwise validly and legitimately consecrat-
 ed), you conclude in a true proposition, though not
 flowing from your premises ; that “ it cannot be de-
 “ nied, that this is legitimate ordination handed down
 “ through those primitive Bishops from the Apostles.”
 But why so costive and sparing of explanation upon
 the valid mode of conferring mission? You dryly add.
 “ Add canonical mission or jurisdiction, which con-
 “ nects Parish Priests with their Bishops, and Bishops
 “ with the Church, and you will have every requisite
 “ for the legitimate exercise of episcopal power *jure*
 “ *divino.*”

Columba-
 nus's arro-
 gant as-
 sumptions
 and errors.

Now, Rev. and most learned Doctor, *whilst the*
pulrabou beats high at your heart, invoke * *Irishmen,*
 “ the countrymen of that great Columbanus who ne-
 “ ver submitted to *ipse dixits*’ who have not yet ren-
 “ dered yourselves unworthy the knowledge of truth
 “ by any wilful dereliction of honesty, or by any con-
 “ scious violation of principle; with whom convic-
 “ tion never was, and I trust never will be a barren
 “ unproductive sentiment of idiot admiration, which
 “ is never to be followed up by any renunciation of
 “ error,

* 4 Col. 7.

“ error, or by any adoption of truth, by any exer-
 “ tion of body, or by any vigor of mind : you, who
 “ have been bred in the school of adversity, are pos-
 “ sessed of high energies, and know how to estimate
 “ that ingenuous frankness of soul, which is necessa-
 “ ry for the admission of truth, &c.” But Reverend
 and most learned Doctor, turn not your back upon
 them ; refuse not to enlighten them ; they are “ the
 “ mass of your people, whose rude ignorance places
 “ them beyond the reach of that *genuine* Catholicity,
 “ which distinguishes the gentry of Ireland beyond
 “ those of every other country in Europe.” Consi-
 der, that Christ came upon earth to evangelize the
 poor. Reflect again, that your countrymen, are the
 people, over whom you say, “ a superstitious and
 “ sottish opinion of the Pope’s power, as dark as
 “ Erebus, as confused, as ignorance could make it,
 “ held the unshaken empire of its leaden sceptre over
 “ their minds.” Come forth most learned Doctor,
 and make good your sublime apostrophe.* “ But
 “ no—Island of ancient sanctity, from whence the
 “ lights of science, and the blessings of religion have
 “ been diffused over the western world ! Columba-
 “ nus has vowed, that the darkness of ignorance
 “ shall never spread from the benighted imagination
 “ of any foreigner, to overshadow thy consecrated
 “ hills. IERNA ! Island of my fathers ! be merci-
 “ ful, as thou expectest mercy : but be careful of the
 “ *language of Revelation.*” Recall to your mind † the
 “ day

* 4 Col. 13.

† 3 Col. 7.

“ day of your ordination in the Church of St. John
 “ Lateran, a day memorable to you as the most awful
 “ of your life, when you solemnly vowed, before the
 “ great altar of that Church in the presence of your
 “ Maker, that you would never sacrifice *one iota* of
 “ your religious opinions, or any of those canons of
 “ the Universal Church, ordinances of sanctity, in-
 “ stitutions of Holiness, and rites *necessarily and inva-*
 “ *riably* connected with our faith, for any earthly
 “ consideration.” Indeed, Rev. Sir, revelation is too
 awful a subject to trifle with so flippantly. You
 have told your countrymen truly, what you or they
 could not have known without revelation: that two
 necessary requisites *jure divino* for Bishops and *Priests*
 are *canonical ordination*, and *canonical mission*. * The
 spiritual qualifications of *ordination* and *mission*, which
 are necessary for “obtaining a Benefice or a Bishop-
 “ rick must be independent of the State.” You go
 on in the same sentence with revolting inconsistency,
 and with an indecent and a profane assumption of
 the insufficiency of a divine institution to its own
 ends, which directly leads to the Anti-Christian con-
 sequence, that Christ had not left his Church under
 such a Government, as would insure her against the
 world and satan unto the end of time: “but those
 “ qualifications are not in the *present state of Ireland*
 “ sufficient without some degree of temporal power.”
 You then put questions, which are either lamentably
 unintelligible, or supinely ignorant. “What incon-
 “ venience

* 4 Col. 90,

“ence can arise from *that temporality* being negatived
 “or confirmed by the State, as long as it is confer-
 “red upon those only, who derive their spiritual au-
 “thority from the Church? Probity and religion
 “are necessary in a Clergyman, valor and fidelity in
 “a soldier, ancient nobility in a knight. But does
 “the King give probity, ordination, or mission, or
 “religion, when he confers a benefice? Does he
 “confer valor, when he enlists a soldier? Does he
 “confer *ancient nobility*, when he dubs a knight? Is
 “it necessary to enlarge on matters *so evident*?”

Certainly not, most learned Doctor, for those, to whom
 the queries are evident. I unfortunately number
 amongst those, who understand them not: *Et nulla*
est difficultas, nisi penes non intelligentem. Lack of
 intellect only creates difficulty. To point out to
 your ignorant countrymen, what *that temporality* is,
 which is *to be negatived or confirmed by the State*, you
 end a long section upon the preliminary steps to be
 taken before a Christian Bishop receives jurisdiction
 or mission, and quote St. Leo's letter to Saint Hilary,
 * “requiring the testimonies of the people, the will
 “of the gentry, and the election of the Clergy,” by
 the following elucidating *Scholium*. “I now proceed
 “to shew you, that all three are equally distinct from
 “the subsequent † *nomination, confirmation, or negative*
 “*of the civil power.*” Upon

* 1 Col. 50. † So you elsewhere say (1 Col 51) “The
 “election of a Bishop to a vacant See is one thing: his *con-*
 “*firmation or nomination* to that See, is another.”

Nomina-
tion, con-
firmation,
and nega-
tive of the
civil pow-
er.

Upon these three *synonima* I observe, that the most correct writers upon Church Government and Ecclesiastical establishments, use the term nomination of Bishops to express or generalize the designation of the person, who is elected, proposed, wished, intended, or recommended to be made the Bishop of a particular diocese, whether such *designatio personæ* be effected by Royal Patent, or other lay presentation, or recommendation, or popular election, or clerical postulation, or any other mode of pointing out to the supreme Bishop, who must be presumed ignorant of the merits of individuals, the most fit and worthy person, upon whom his Holiness should confer mission or spiritual jurisdiction. *Nomination* therefore from its nature varies in every community, and is controulable by the civil magistrate, wherever he gives a civil establishment to the religion, of which the nominee is to become a Prelate or a *Church Governor*. *Confirmation* is used to express the act performed by the Pope alone, which makes the nominee the Bishop of the particular diocese: it is of course subsequent to *nomination*, and is the collation of mission, which you admit to be a divine right independent of the temporal power, or civil magistrate. The *negative of the civil power* is new, and in fact a chymera, a theological *hircocervus* not mentioned in any writer, till within these four or five years. It cannot be synonymous or simultaneous with *confirmation*, because if at all exercised, it is to prevent the *nominee* from being confirmed

confirmed. Theologically it cannot exist ; because if it have any effect, it is to controul the *divine right* of the supreme Bishop to grant mission. Mission *ex concessis* is independent of the civil magistrate or temporal power : *ex concedendis* therefore it cannot be controuled by any human, *civil*, or *temporal* authority whatever. You must allow me then, most learned Doctor, to express not only my astonishment, but my pity and contempt at the egregious nonsense you have written about Symmachus having been confirmed in his election or nomination to the Holy See,* by Theodoric the Arian ; “ he having been in
 “ this hypothesis, *invalidly* appointed, by an heretical violation of revealed faith.” Whence you conclude, with your habitual incoherency. “ Therefore
 “ the nomination even of a Pope by an Arian Prince,
 “ and *a fortiori* by a Protestant Government, which
 “ acknowledges the divinity of our Saviour against
 “ Arius, and the efficacy of his mediation against Socinus is not inconsistent with the Catholic faith ;
 “ and consequently the civil power, though Protestant, may exercise a limited negative in the nomination of Catholic Bishops.” This more than Beotian crassitude assumes, that the civil magistrate acquires power over spiritual objects, in proportion to the *plus* or the *minus* of his orthodoxy on the Christian doctrine. Whereas the civil magistrate, whose obligatory powers St. Peter and St. Paul so
 2 Q emphatically

* 1 Col. 52 to 54.

emphatically enforce, was an idolatrous magistrate, who persecuted the Christians : and yet these inspired writers allowed him the same supremacy and independence of civil power, as was ever claimed by, or attributed to the first Christian Emperor Constantine, St. Louis of France, Alfred, or St. Edward the Confessor with an English Parliament. It would be beneath drivelling to suppose or argue, that the nature, extent, or efficacy of civil or temporal power varied with the Euripus of the follies and vices, or even virtues of Sovereigns and Statesmen. Eternally true is it, that the non-use, mis-use or abuse of spiritual power by those, who are invested with it, cannot alter its divine origin, vary its effects, or transmute the means of acquiring it.

Columbanus's false doctrine about Papal Supremacy.

Irishmen beware! Again I say beware! Believe not your *new*, and I hesitate not to add, your *arrogant* and *insidious* reformer. He tells you falsely, that, “ *the Pope's supremacy by divine right consists only in a power of inspecting the conduct of all the orders of the hierarchy, that the faith we outerly profess shall be conformable with the revelation of Christ, and that our morals shall be conformable with our faith.* * “ It “ is on this *visible* agreement of *faith* and *morals*,† “ that

* 1 Col. 87.

† This lame defective and false representation of the papal supremacy *by divine right* according to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, not only proves how widely (in my humble opinion though I avoid the controversy) Columbanus diverges from

“ that the unity of the church is founded : and it is
 “ for the preservation of that *visible unity*, that we

2 Q 2

“ have

her orthodoxy ; but how systematically insidious and decep-
 tive he is to his countrymen and others, whom he labours to
 seduce into schism and error. The true Jansenistical *Papap-*
hobia pervades all his publications : not a syllable in the five
 numbers touching the jurisdiction of the Pope, how derived
 from Christ ; how vested *jure divino* in Peter, how derivable
 from Peter's successors to the individuals of the dispersed
 churches. The very term *Church Government* does not (to my
 recollection) once occur, as used by him : and the idea of it
 is smothered, disguised and removed from the eye of the reader
 with unblushing hardyhood and malign industry. This insidious
 reduction of the papal supremacy to an *inquisitorial* and *cor-*
rective power is assumed for the direct purpose of keeping out
 of sight the original source of jurisdiction, which for the pur-
 pose of perpetuating the government of Christ's church must
 flow from it's visible head on earth : and it is attempted by the
 most barefaced misquotation and infidelity of translation.
 Still playing the Roman Catholic, he flatters the opinions of
 his supposed brethren in faith with a reference to Bishop Burnet,
 (1 Col. 97) who “ endeavours to apologize for some of
 “ those (i e Protestant) doctrines and practices, which he
 “ acknowledges to be erroneous observing, that the Apostles
 “ continued to pray in the temple of Jerusalem, and to circumcize
 “ after the abolition of the Mosaic Law, and that the compilers
 “ of the 39 Articles worded them with *proposed ambiguity*, so
 “ as to leave the divines of the time, whose principles were
 “ obviously inconsistent with each other, each in possession
 “ of his own particular tenets, provided, that all confederated
 “ against the ancient church ? This was a levy *en masse* of
 “ the good, the bad, and the indifferent : a confederacy of
 “ *obvious inconsistencies*.” Upon the merit of this Catholic

“ have a *visible head* whose primacy existed in the
 “ days of St. Peter, as full as in the pompous days
 “ of

effusion, he attempted to associate himself with Grotius a very learned and amiable character, and with Melancthon the most moderate of reformers, in order to impose upon his unwary readers. He informs them, “ that *Petavius*, (a real orthodox “ divine) and the celebrated *Arnaud* (a noted though learned “ Jansenist) declare, that Grotius mentioned to them his “ intention of returning from the confusions of innovation to “ die in the communion of the Catholic Church. Some of his “ Protestant friends said of him *Grotius papizans*. He him- “ self says, that there can be no Union of christians without “ a common head, for the *unity of faith and morals*. See Appendix II.” Now upon referring to this extract from Grotius, so far is he from saying, that there can be no Union of christians without a common head *for the preservation of unity of faith and morals*, that neither of those words occur in the text. The cause alledged by Grotius, is, *Protestantes nullo inter se communi Ecclesiastico regimine sociantur* : which words (for a wonder) he has translated with tolerable fairness, *Protestants have no common church government, in which they are united*. To shew more emphatically, that without uniting with those, who are in communion with the See of Rome, there could be no proper church government, he says, *sine qua nullum sperari potest in ecclesia commune regimen* : which most important words, he has thought proper entirely to omit in his translation. They import, *without which no common government can be hoped for in the church*. Grotius supports his opinion by that of Melancthon, who likewise confesses, “ that he thinks, that such su- “ premacy is necessary for the preserving of unity.” In the next page of his Appendix, he quotes, and gives as translation from Melancthon (whether correctly I know not) the following words : “ Primacy,” says Melancthon, “ is ever necessary

“ of Leo X. In this, and in *this only*, consists the
 “ Pope’s supremacy *by divine right*.” Having thus
 degraded the Christian Primate from a supremacy of
 dignity and jurisdiction over all Christendom into
 the humble functions of *inquisitor opinionum & præ-*
fectus morum, you interrogate with senseless arrogance.

“ Does
 “ to *preserve union*. We agree, that the presiding of Bishops
 “ over many churches, and the Bishops of Rome over all
 “ Bishops is a lawful form of government. The Monarchy
 “ of the Pope could also conduce very much to preserve
 “ different nations in agreement of doctrine.” Thus it
 evidently appears, that Grotius and Melancthon consider-
 ed the primacy of the Pope as monarchical, and necessary
 for keeping up *Church Government*, without which the unity of
 the church could not be preserved: the agreement of doctrine
 is treated by Melancthon as a secondary consideration or inci-
 dental consequence. By Grotius’s reference to the opinion of
 Melancthon in support of his own, he avows, that they both
 concurred in the grounds and consequences of their opinions.
 Without meaning to derogate from the dignity, rights, and
 powers of the Christian Priesthood, I cannot refrain from re-
 marking, that Melancthon introduces not into the government
 of the church the second order of the clergy. The only church
 governors he speaks of are *Bishops*. Thus his Reverence,
 closes his * maxims, which he gives “ as infallible rules in ec-
 “ clesiastical affairs. As metropolitans cannot make laws for
 “ their respective provinces without the concurrence of their
 “ suffragans in a provincial synod, so neither could the Pope
 “ make laws for the universal church, &c.” These must have
 been *exclusive* synods, unless the word *suffragans* tet in the cler-
 gy of the second order by a strained construction. But *ubi Co-*
rona presbyterii?

* 4 Col. 125.

* “Does it follow, because the Pope has a right of
 “ universal inspection and vigilance, in order that the
 “ genuine canons of *general* Councils be not violated
 “ in the collation of benefices, that therefore those
 “ benefices, are his personal property, and that the
 “ State cannot determine the number or the limits of
 “ dioceses or parishes within its own dominions with-
 “ out his consent?” You truly assert, that * “ Bish-
 “ ops can no more give jurisdiction beyond the limits
 “ of their own dioceses, than Parish Priests can be-
 “ yond the limits of their own parishes.” “ All re-
 “ quire a regular mission, which is limited by the
 “ Church.” You then with inconsistency and false-
 hood add: “ And may, in some cases be limited by
 “ the State: for the extent of a diocese may be fixed
 “ by the *civil power*.” Your Reverence blows hot
 and cold: you hold directly contradictory opinions.
 Who would suppose, or could without seeing believe,
 that the same man had the effrontery to say, * “ with-
 “ out a mission from the Church, there can be no
 “ ecclesiastical jurisdiction, no valid administration
 “ sacraments? and that a regular mission may in
 “ some cases be limited even by the state.” There is
 both truth and falsity in your summary declaration or
 conclusion. † “ Here then are the necessary requisites
 “ *jure divino* for Bishops and Priests, viz. canonical
 “ *election*, canonical *ordination*, and canonical *mission*,
 “ and these must be independent of the *civil power*.”

You

* 4 Col. 91. † 4 Col. 39. ‡ 1 Col. 105. § 1 Col. Ibid.

You favor your readers with a very ingenious illustrative, and conclusive observation, upon which, as ^{His confusion about mission.} upon a point of infallible inspiration, you rest your merit. * “Spiritual jurisdiction is not like a lump of matter, which can be divided into bits and scraps by the dismemberment or the division of a territory: and a Bishop’s jurisdiction may be subject to the rules of the Abbot’s of Hyona, of Bangor, or of Cluanmacnoise. All who read Columbanus’s letters, will find this to be his doctrine.” And curious doctrine it is. How the indivisibility of *spiritual jurisdiction* proves, that in some cases it may be *limited by the State* I want ingenuity to discover. You say it is independent of the State: and that it is *jure divino*: how then can the power, which cannot create or grant it, be enabled to limit it: and how can circumstances transpose the objects of the *civil* to the spiritual power, or *vice versa*? For each being independent of the other by their nature, cannot acquire or lose any of those objects, which God’s ordinances have severally and respectively enabled them to act upon. The civil magistrate cannot enlarge, nor diminish the rights or powers, which you say *truly* are independent of the civil power; and *falsely*, that they are *jure divino*. If *spiritual jurisdiction* or *canonical mission*, be as you say, a *jure divino* requisite for a Bishop and Priest, that, like every *divine institution* in the Church of Christ, must be universal in its extent,

tent, indispensable in its obligation, and immutable in its operation until the end of time: that is, as long as Christ has promised his Church shall last. It is then inconsistent of you to subject that *jure divino* mission to any other, than the giver of it, from whom it is derived; and pitifully ignorant to subject that mission to monastic rules of religious orders, whose superiors or subjects, have no regular place, rank, or degree in the Christian hierarchy. Again you *truly* say, that * “the ministry of Priests is illicit without a mission, and so is equally illicit without a mission, the ministry of Bishops.” But in the same place you unwarrantably conclude, that, “as Bishops derive mission from our Saviour through the Church, so Priests derive mission from our Saviour, through the Church also,”

Columbanus practises fraud on his countrymen.

Your ferocious attack upon my abilities, credit, and character, as an author, imposes upon me, Rev. and most learned Doctor, a duty to appear at my post, whilst you labour to mislead your countrymen sometimes with Jansenian cant; *I would die for the genuine articles of the Catholic faith,† and for the interests of our religion I would, were it necessary, spill the last drop of my blood;§* whilst at other times with the profane *sneer of infidelity*, which you observe, *§ it is easier to learn than unlearn*, you attempt to laugh or shame them out of their religious practices, and whilst unceasingly with *Richerian* perfidy and impiety you divest

* 4 Col. 38. † 1 Col. 9. ‡ 3 Col. 46. § 3 Col. 40.

divest the head of their Church of all *jurisdictional*
 * prerogative, right, power, and authority, wishing to
 2 R transfer

* I have before remarked, that Columbanus (in the true spirit of PORT ROYAL, the grand palladium of Jansenism at Paris) had manifested such voracity for a vizor of orthodoxy, that he had not scrupled to forge an assertion, and put it into the mouth of Doctor Poynter. With like intent has he throughout his five numbers most studiously avoided any direct, positive, or negative proposition concerning the source, exercise, or derivation of spiritual jurisdiction or mission by or from the chair of Peter: he has put many insidious and captious questions, which he has left unanswered behind a non-responsible shield; *magis docet, qui prudenter interrogat?* He has throughout smothered, confused, or holden back information and instruction, which his subject called for, with a view to give strength and currency to unsound doctrines, which he wished to promote, but which he durst not explicitly avow, nor openly advocate. Such instances, as we find in Peter Walsh's letter to the Bishop of Lincoln (p. 275) where, speaking of the canons of the universal church and the Pope, he says, "We see it plain enough
 " in the very words, that they attribute only *primatum*, a *pri-*
 " *macy* of power over the whole world, not a *supremacy*; and conse-
 " quently neither a *vicarship* nor *headship*, nor a fulness, nor in-
 " deed any measure at all of that, which is in reality and pro-
 " perly and strictly called *jurisdictional power* to the Pope, as
 " given to him by Christ in *Peter* to govern the universal church:
 " so it is no less plain out of the latter, which is the restrictive
 " part of them, that the exercise of his power, whatever it be,
 " is limited by them, is confined to the former practice of œcu-
 " menical councils, and import of their sacred canons; and both
 " it and himself left wholly subject to both, being he was so be-
 " fore, according to the acts of all former general councils of
 " both churches (i. e. orient and occident) and their sacred

transfer this whole *power of the keys* from the Governors of Christ's kingdom on earth, to the civil magistrate, which would of course display a new chart of navigation to the episcopal Sees, and open an inviting Visto of influence to let in the *interest of gentry and nobility* * to crown the *honest exertions* † of candidates for mitres, and thus *transmit a legal national church to posterity.* ‡ In practising fraud, there is equal criminality in the *suppressio veri*, as there is in the *suggestio falsi*. Now, most learned Doctor, I directly charge you throughout your five addresses with studiously suppressing the truth of the doctrines and usages of your Catholic countrymen, with reference to the Papal supremacy from the introduction of Christianity into the Island down to your own days, and with falsely suggesting, that the Gallican Church disclaimed and resisted Papal jurisdiction; and that the declaration of the Gallican clergy about ecclesiastical power was made *against* the jurisdiction of the Pope. For this purpose you have maliciously mutilated

“ canons too. But of this somewhat more hereafter, which will
 “ illustrate what I said but now concerning no *jurisdictional*
 “ power, properly and strictly such attributed by this Floren-
 “ tine Council to the Pope.” In the very next page (276) Peter Walsh boasts of supporting his doctrines upon the authority of the *illustrious divines Richerius & Launois*: For more particulars of the credit, conduct and doctrines of *Richer & Launois*, the reader is referred to the Appendix, No. III.

* 3 Col. 16. † 1 Col. 21. ‡ 3 Col. 46.

tilated and garbled that declaration, as may be seen in the Appendix, No. V. Although this matter borders on theology, yet in as much as it involves the grounds, upon which the Irish hierarchy, clergy, and laity have resisted, and still do resist the *Veto*, which forms a prominent question or rather intrigue in modern Irish History, it behoves me to notice some authorities against both your suppressions of truth, and suggestions of falsehood, lest you might appear to have had reason for entituling the 20th Section of your Second Letter, *Mr. Plowden, his shameful ignorance of Irish History.*

Perhaps your most learned Reverence has amongst your other illucubrations *removed all future occasion of controversy* about the mission of Saint Patrick into Ireland, *by establishing that leading event on the immutable basis of astronomical calculation* (Doctor O'Connor's account in Dodsley for 1803 of his *Rerum Hybernicarum Scriptores Antiqui*, p. 938. N. B. Unpublished in 1812) and fixed the opening of his mission somewhere about the year 377; in that case he was for many years of his life cotemporary with the great Saint Athanasius, who died on the 2d of May, 373. I know not exactly the degree of estimation, in which your Reverence holds that great assertor of Catholic orthodoxy, Christian liberty, and episcopal jurisdiction, against the subtle errors of the sanctimonious Arius, couched under captious tests and formulas, and backed by the overbearing interference of the

Jurisdictional authority of the Pope in the 4th century.

civil magistrate. It has been a late prevailing fashion to represent that great character and pillar of the Catholic Church as an obstinate zealot, a *bout-feu*, a mere fanatic, an *opposer of the salutary restraints of the law*, a *foreign-influence man*, an *Apostolic mastiff*. I however humbly entreat leave to give a counterwarning to your countrymen, as well as to my own, that those two great luminaries of the primitive church, Saint Patrick and Saint Athanasius agreed in their opinions upon the jurisdictional authority and rights of the Holy See: consequently, that what St. Athanasius in confusion of Arian duplicity, and in defiance of the civil sword of the Arian Emperor Constantine said *in facie ecclesiæ* was precisely the doctrine taught by Saint Patrick to your first Christian ancestors; and I am free to say, it widely differs from that broached in these latter days by *Richer*, *Launois*, *Peter Walsh*, and eke by *Columbanus*. That great Prelate, of the oriental church, addressed his Holiness in these words. “It is unanimously admitted by all our
 “aforesaid brethren, that an appeal lies to your holy
 “Roman See, to which by special prerogative the
 “power of loosing and binding was imparted by our
 “Lord himself. She was fixed by God as the foundation, she is the sacred pivot, on which all are
 “moved, supported, and raised up.” About midway between the fourth and the seventeenth century, Saint Bernard in the twelfth century, shows the prevailing doctrine throughout the Church in his day,
 of

Of this jurisdictional authority of the Roman Pontiff, saying, *that the appeal to Rome was necessary in the Church, as the Sun was in the world.* From the commencement of the seventeenth century to the close of the eighteenth, as we behold at the commencement of the nineteenth century, there has appeared an inordinate and insatiable lust in all the opponents of Papal jurisdiction to affiliate or associate themselves with the Gallican clergy, thinking thereby to be countenanced under their authority, in their hostility to the chair of Peter. For Columbanus's unworthy, indecent, and base efforts to effectuate this wicked purpose by disfiguring and maiming the Gallican declaration of 1682, we again remitt our reader to the Appendix, No. V. But for the strict conformity of doctrine upon the *jurisdictional authority* of the chair of Peter in the 17th century with that of St. Athanasius in the fourth, and Saint Bernard in the twelfth, I send my reader to a declaration of a numerous assembly of the Gallican clergy on the 20th of January 1620, who speak of it, as of a fundamental maxim of the Hierarchy, upon the observance of which the preservation of the church substantially rests. “ Hortamur episcopos omnes, ut Apostolicam sedem, utpote Dei sponsione infallibili fundatam, omniumque ecclesiarum matrem omni honore cultuque prosequantur. Ipsa enim, ut cum Beato Athanasio loquamur, est sacrum illud caput, a quo in omnes ecclesias veluti totidem membra

“bra, omnis spiritus diffunditur, quo nutriuntur & “conservantur.” We exhort all Bishops to pay all honor and worship to the Apostolic See, as having been founded upon the infallible promise of God, the mother of all churches. For she, to speak with blessed Athanasius, is that sacred head, from which to all churches, as to so many members, all the life is communicated, by which they are nourished and preserved.” Again, St. Bernard says, * “In the church “there must be an universal governor, from whom the “authority of governing (or jurisdiction) may descend “to the mesne governors, even to the lowest rectors; “and this is the Pope; and upon this rests the unity “of the church, because all the members are under “one head: for which reason, those, who deny him “this power, are called schismatics.” St. Thomas of Aquin † (he flourished in the thirteenth century) holds the same doctrines “Christ promised to Peter “alone, I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of “Heaven, that it might be manifest, that the power “of

* Lib III. De Consid. C. viii. In ecclesia debet esse universalis rector, a quo descendat auctoritas regendi in medios, usque ad rectores infimos; & hic est Papa: et propter hoc stat unitas ecclesiæ, quod omnia membra sunt ab uno Capite: qua de causa, illi qui hanc potestatem negant schismatici dicuntur.”

† *Contra gentes.* Christus soli Petro promisit, tibi dabo claves regni cælorum, ut ostenderetur *potestas clavium* ad alios per illum *derevanda.*

“ of the keys (or spiritual jurisdiction) was to be de-
 “ rived through him to others.” Before these, *Hinc-*
mar Archbishop of Rheims” (A. D. 845) a learn-
 ed man, and a zealous supporter of the rights of the
 Gallican church and the purity of Catholic doctrine,
 speaking of the Pope, said, * “ From whom the stream
 “ of religion and ecclesiastical ordination and canoni-
 “ cal jurisdiction flows.” Pope Benedict the 14th,
 with whose opinions from your reference to his au-
 thority, your Reverence wishes, I presume, to be
 considered, as coinciding, has explicitly said, that
 * “ The jurisdiction of Bishops, whether it be imme-
 “ diately from Christ, or from the Sovereign Pontiff,
 “ is so subject to the latter, that as all Catholics
 “ agree, it may be limited by his authority and com-
 “ mand, and entirely taken away for a legitimate
 “ cause.” Now whatever right or power rests *jure*
divino in a human being, cannot be limited, altered,
 suspended, or taken away by any power on earth,
 neither of Church or Pope, much less by any derivative
 authority from them, and least of all, by the *civil ma-*
gistratus. Thus the powers of ordination in Bishops,
 and

* A quo rivus religionis, & ecclesiasticæ ordinationis, atque
 canonicæ jurisdictionis profluit. *Ad Hines. Land.*

† Dia Synod. L. VII. C. VII. No. 7. Episcoporum juris-
 dictio, sive sit immediate a Christo, sive a summo Pontifice, ita
 huic subest, ut consentientibus omnibus Catholicis, ejus auc-
 toritate & imperio limitari, atque ex causa legitima auferre
 possit.

and of absolution and consecration in Priests so inalienably attach to the individuals by the power of God, when they receive consecration or order, that they never can be taken away or extinguished. But for preserving Government and unity in the Church, Christ vested in St. Peter and his successors a *jure divino* right of controuling, modifying, suspending, reviving, and prohibiting the legitimate exercise of them. So *De Marca*, whom you very justly extoll, and whose authority you therefore ought the more to revere, tells you, that, “if provincial councils formerly exercised this power, it was because this jurisdiction being purely an ecclesiastical right, it may vary: but it is invariable in the Sovereign Pontiff, because it rests in him by *divine right*, as the completion (or perfecting) of his jurisdiction.”

Columbanus against himself.

The last authority I shall quote for proof of my assertion, that you unwarrantably assured your countrymen, that canonical mission is vested *jure divino* in every Bishop and every Priest; meaning, as I must suppose you do, a Bishop with a See, and a Priest with a Parish, and both with cure of souls, is one, that I know you value above all others, and am very confident, you wish your countrymen to hold it in the like estimation. The Rev. Charles O'Connor, D. D. in his publication, under the title of, *Columbanus ad Hybernos*, No. IV. p. 41, in a note, which points out the absurdity of some Scotch writers attempting to prove, that

* Conc. Sacerd. L. VI. C. 8.

that the Culdee establishments were Presbyterian, and that their Presbyters were not ordained by Bishops, makes the following judicious and pertinent remarks. “After this I leave it to the candor of the
 “Scotch, an enlightened and a learned nation, to
 “judge how far they can depend on a system so repugnant to the most leading principle and practice
 “of primitive Christianity. I heartily join with them
 “in their condemnation of the absolute * monarchy principles

2S

principles

* Surely the most learned Doctor must have forgotten, that he had in his first letter p. 85, quoted the words of that most papal of all papal writers to prove, that Bellarmine did not hold these *absolute monarchy principles*. *Monarchicum, sed temporatum ex Aristocratia & democratia*. It would be endless to follow Columbanus through all his wanderings from consistency and truth. The difference, which Bellarmine points out in the succession of the Popes to St. Peter, and of other Bishops to the Apostles is clear and illustrative of the doctrine, which has always been holden by the church, viz. that the Bishop of Rome succeeds Peter, not in his quality of *Apostolus*, but as ordinary Pastor of the whole church, or Primate *jure divino*. Columbanus against the general stream of opinions, in order to prove, that the jurisdiction of the Parish Priest is equally of *divine right* with that of every Bishop, even of the Pope, quotes St. Paul's words to the Ephesians, C. iv. V. ii. He gave some *Apostles*, and some *Prophets*, and some *Evangelists*, and some *Pastors* and *Teachers* for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the *Ministry*, &c. and in order to falsify, what Doctor Poynter truly said upon the highest authority, “that from the beginning of the Church
 “Priests had *no lawful mission, but what they received from Bish-*
 “*ops.*” Columbanus says, that he is expressly contradicted by St. Luke, C. x. Whoever reads that Chapter will perceive,

“ principles of a Bellarmine, but there is a passage
 “ in that extraordinary man’s book, *De Romano Pon-*
tifice,

that Christ gave a special and limited commission to a certain number of his disciples. “ After these things the Lord appointed other seventy also, and sent them two and two before his face into every city and place, whither he himself would come.” Then follow the instructions for this extraordinary mission. When their circuits were ended, they reported the results to their divine master. “ And the seventy returned again with joy, saying, Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through thy name.” The Evangelist does not inform us, that these seventy, or any one of them, received any further commission from our blessed Lord. It is evident, that they were not then in orders : for there existed no Christian Priesthood, or Church till after Christ’s resurrection ; though probably many (perhaps all) of them were afterwards ordained, and employed in the ministry. Does not this example of our divine Saviour seem to direct and warrant his Vicar upon earth to send special commissions throughout every part of the dispersed churches, wherever the exigencies of his flock call upon the interference of his plenary jurisdiction, or power over them. It would have been consonant with the professions, though dissonant from the practice of Columbanus, had he informed his countrymen, that Doctor Poynter proved his assertion by many authorities ; the first of which was that of St. Ignatius, who was made Bishop of Antioch, A. D. 68, and suffered martyrdom at Rome, A. D. 107. His Epistles are a precious repository of the faith and discipline of the primitive Christians. In that to the Smyrnians, he says, “ Without the Bishop let nobody do any of those things, which belong to the church. “ It is not lawful without the Bishop either to baptize or celebrate the *Agapæ* (love feasts for catechumens and charities) “ but whatever he approves of, that is well accepted of by

“*tifice*, L. 4. C. xxv. fol ed. p. 886, which claims
 “their attention. Potestas ordinis requirit caracte-
 “rem & gratiam, quam solus Deus efficere potest.
 “Jurisdictio solum requirit superioris voluntatem.
 “Perhaps also, if Doctor Pointer had attended to
 “this distinction, he would have spared himself the
 “trouble of claiming exclusive jurisdiction *jure di-*
 “*vino*.” Here you introduce a * letter, “written
 as you say, before you “had any idea of Doctor
 “Poynter’s attack; the original is in the hand of a
 “person of high rank.” The letter has so much
learning in it, besides the advantage of its being in the
 hands of a person of high rank, that it forced upon
 you the home stroke of La Mothe’s lash at a pedant.†
 “*Dieu vous fasse la grace de devenir moins scavant*.”
 What a deluge of quotation! How relevant and il-
 lustrative of the doctrines of a librarian, whose letters
 can reach the hand of a *person of high rank*! As your
 biblical Reverence has not condescended to English
 the grand quotation from Bellarmine, which claims the
 attention of the enlightened and learned Scotch na-
 tion, and has some how eluded the attention of Doc-
 tor Poynter, and appears to have so baffled the hallu-
 cinated mind of *Columbanus*, as to have driven it *mau-*

252

gre

“GOD.” “*Sine Episcopo nemo quidquam faciat eorum, quæ ad*
 “*ecclesiam spectant. Non licet sine episcopo baptizare, neque agapen*
 “*celebrare: sed quodcunque ille probaverit, hoc et Deo est beneplaci-*
 “*tum*.”

* 4 Col 40.

† 4 Col. 43.

gre his lust for aberration, into a by-path of truth, I shall translate it, for the benefit of such of my readers, as understand not the dead language, in which that extraordinary man's book is written, and from which the most learned of Doctors has selected this mystical passage to corroborate his own, and confute the thesis of all his adversaries. *The power of order requires a character and grace, which God alone can effect: (i.e. unalienable and unextinguishable powers are by God annexed to order) jurisdiction only requires the will of the superior. (i. e. wholly depends upon the will of the Pope.)* It was therefore said by Durand the worthy predecessor of the great Bossuet; that * “In others, (than the Pope) jurisdiction is “only derivative, and limited as the Pope pleaseth.”

Columbanus takes unfair advantage of Fleury the ecclesiastical historian,

Having so pointedly charged your Reverence with a conscious intent of deceiving your countrymen, and with laboured efforts to seduce them from their spiritual obedience to the Christian Primate, by plunging them into direct schism under the hypocritical cant of Jansenistical Puritanism, I should leave the charge less perfectly substantiated, were I to pass unnoticed your constant reference to Fleury (from whom you have borrowed largely and not always fairly) with the insidious view of identifying your doctrines with those of that learned and respected character. By mutilating

* In aliis non est nisi derivata (jurisdictio) et limitata prout Papæ placet.

mutilating and defacing the declaration of the Gallican Clergy, and by furtively catching hold of the mantle of this Gallican divine, you arrogate to yourself a double portion of his spirit, and presumptuously smite the waters of Jordan, that they may part hither and thither; but you shall not, like Elisha, go over on dry ground. Fleury erred in urging too strongly the immutability of church discipline: he was too much wedded to primitive usages, and too violently prepossessed against modern alterations. Discipline is in its nature variable; and would be essentially defective, if not adaptable to the fluctuation of governments, men and manners, Erasmus (he was no *foreign influence man*, and from other peculiarities has a call upon your sympathies) after having entered into a minute comparison of the ancient and modern discipline in all its bearings, came to this conclusion, upon the Church Government of his own times, which were those of the first reformers, * that “If St. Paul were to return to the earth, the then actual state of Church Government would not displease him.” It is also necessary to apprise my readers, that the work of Fleury, which is the most esteemed, (namely his *discourses upon ecclesiastical history*) has been considerably altered by the party in France, which was always on the watch, to wrest every author

* Erasmus was so connected with Luther, that it was an usual saying at that time, *aut Lutherus Erasmizat, aut Erasmus Lutherizat*. Something like *Grotius papizans*.

thor of reputation by misconstruction or distortion to their Anti-Papal objects and designs. In the first edition of that work, his discourse upon the liberties of the Gallican Church is the 9th, and the 12th in all subsequent editions, which contain many substantial alterations, and notes to disfigure, and force the original meaning of the author. I am free to say, that Fleury, even with all the freedom, with which he speaks of the rights of the See of Rome, does not fully discriminate between the nature and effects of *spiritual and temporal* power. He says, that from the earliest times *the church* has possessed landed property. * “Mais des les premiers tems l'Eglise a possede des immœubles & des fiefs.” If by *the Church* he there mean any representation of Christ's universal church militant upon earth, or that kingdom, which he told us, is not of this world, the possibility of the whole, the head, or parts acquiring the dominion or property of land is absolutely denied. All property is in fact the creature of the civil power: and it is out of the competency of the spiritual power or jurisdiction, by which Christ's kingdom is governed, to touch, alter, or affect it. The incorrectness of his deduction from the first proposition, marks the confusion of his ideas upon this important subject, and leaves us therefore more at liberty to dissent from some other effects of his want of discrimination and judgment. “On ne voit pas ce qui rend les ecclesiastiques

* Paris Edition of 1763. p. 411.

“astiques incapables de gouverner aussi les hommes libres.” One sees not what renders clergymen incapable also of governing free men. Such blundering and floundering in men of learning are inconceivable. To confound the terms *Church* and *Clergymen*! These latter may be Priests or not Priests: they may have jurisdiction or be without it; for *according to your Reverence*, and some others, as I have shewn, this *solum requirit superioris voluntatem*. But whether the Clergymen, of whom Fleury speaks in his deduction, have in them *by divine right* the inalienable powers of ordination, consecration, and absolution, and *ex voluntate viri* by the will of their superior, the authority of legitimately exercising them within such boundaries as their superior shall limit, no civil effect whatever was produced thereby on the individual, so ordained or instituted: he thereby neither gained nor lost any *civil* rights he before had in him. St. Paul’s ordination or mission extinguished not in him the rights of a free born Roman citizen, not to be scourged uncondemned.

When my reader reflects, Rev. and most learned Doctor, who it was, that boasted of his *never having perverted the words of any man to answer his own purposes of malignity or revenge; that wherever a passage was obscure, he explained it by the author’s context, wherever it was clear he gave its plain, obvious, admitted meaning*, he will, I am confident be astounded, to find this very Fleury laying down doctrines so pointedly

Fleury contradicts Columbanus.

edly contradictory of yours. In his 12th discourse upon the liberties of the Gallican Church, he says, “ We believe also with all Catholics, that the Pope, “ Bishop of Rome, and the successor of St. Peter, “ and as such, the visible head of the Church, and “ that he is so *by divine right*, because Jesus Christ “ has said, thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will “ build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And again, Peter lovest thou me? “ Feed my sheep. We hope, that God will never “ permit error to prevail in the holy See of Rome, as “ it has happened in other Apostolic Sees of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem; because Jesus Christ “ has said, I have prayed for thee (Peter), that thy “ faith fail not. We believe, that the Pope is principally charged with the instruction and direction of “ his flock, because it is said: and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren; and again: feed “ my sheep, not only the lambs, but the sheep. But “ we also believe (mark, he says not with all Catholics), that all Bishops have received their power immediately from Jesus Christ, because he said to the “ Apostles, receive ye the Holy Ghost. And Saint “ Paul speaking to Bishops says, the Holy Ghost has “ appointed you to govern the Church of God.” Whether this be the original doctrine of Abbe Fleury or of the Editors of the Second Edition, I have not an opportunity of examining. Either the author was originally not clear, or his interpolators purposely rendered

rendered him ambiguous. His use of the word *power* cannot fairly be taken as synonymous with *jurisdiction*, as he is speaking of Bishops in general, which imports the order of episcopacy; and then it is true, that the power, which they have received by their consecration (viz. of ordaining Priests, which you allow: I add of *confirmation* also, which you seem in part to disallow) they receive immediately from Jesus Christ. So Priests have inalienable rights and powers by virtue of their ordination, as we have before observed.* “The jurisdiction (you yourself acknowledge) of Bishops, as well as of Priests, is derived by mission from the Church. All Parish Priests have jurisdiction *ex officio* in their parishes, as well as Bishops in their dioceses.” This is a very clear, explicit, and true proposition, as far as it goes to prove, that the Bishop’s mission depends as much upon the *voluntas superioris*, as the Rector’s or Curate’s. In point of fact, you add, † “as Bishops derive mission from our Saviour through the church, so Priests derive mission through the Church also. The ministry of Priests is illicit without a mission, and so is equally illicit without a mission, the ministry of Bishops.” These corresponding relations of Bishop to Pope, and Rector to Bishop, though fairly and truly put by your Reverence, are not at all sanctioned by Fleury, by the hem of whose mantle you wish to hold. Thus fares it with all wanderers,

2 T

* 4 Col. 36. † 4 Col. 38.

derers from the straight road of truth; they are perpetually jostling and crossing each other, in the devious tracks of error. **“There is, therefore,”* says the French Abbè, *“a great difference between Bishops and Curates. † Curates hold their power immediately of their Bishop, who always retains the right of exercising all manner of spiritual functions in each parish (of his diocese) “and it is but as to the order of Priesthood, that the institution of the Curate is of divine institution.”* If fairly and impartially considered, the very principles, upon which Fleury demonstrates against your Reverence, that a Rector, or Parish Priest by virtue of his institution receives his mission only from his Bishop, (which is the truth) as conclusively evince, that a Bishop by virtue of his confirmation from the Pope, receives his jurisdiction or mission over the diocese, to which his Holiness appoints him; all this falls in consistently with your own admission, that *jurisdictio solum requirit superioris voluntatem*. So you rightly say, *in that institution the spirituality does really consist*. And *“by ordination Priests receive the power of consecrating the elements, and remitting or retaining sins, and Bishops, that of ordaining Priests and Deacons,*

* Fleury's 12th Discourse, p. 424.

† If I mistake not, in the French ecclesiastical establishment, the *Curé* answers to our Rector or Vicar: that is the person, who has committed to him by the Bishop the care of the souls of the Parish. *Vicaire* answers to our Curate.

“ Deacons, &c. but the former receive no parish, and
 “ the latter no diocese.”*

† Irishmen beware of your self-appointed reformer! Further errors of Columbanus;
 when he fritters down the Vicar of Christ into an
Inquisitor and a *Corrigedor*, and levels him with Mr.
 Speaker Abbott; call upon him for the proofs of his

2 T 2

mission

* 1 Col. 104.

† 1 Col. 101: So Columbanus elsewhere adduces an instance (though not without some confusion of terms) of persons being ordained or consecrated Bishops merely for the purpose of ordaining such religious of certain monasteries, as were to be admitted to the Priesthood. This is, I presume, what he before confusedly alluded to, by saying, that the jurisdiction of a Bishop may be subject to the rules of the Abbots of Hiona, Bangor, or Cluanmacnoise. (4Col.45) “ There may be Bishops
 “ at this day, as there always were in Ireland, established in
 “ monasteries, and subject to the rules of those monasteries, and
 “ to the jurisdiction of the Abbots; but yet superior to all orders of the hierarchy with respect to ordination, and *necessa-*
 “ *ry*, essentially necessary, for the ordination of the Priests
 “ and the Deacons of those monasteries, to which they belonged.” It is perfectly intelligible, that in the vast monastic establishments, which once existed in Ireland, (consisting even of thousands) a Monk of the order might have been by a special commission of the Pope consecrated a Bishop merely for the purpose of performing the functions of episcopal order, such as ordaining Priests, confirming the youth educated in or at these monasteries, consecrating altars, &c. which, without jurisdiction or mission over a diocese, would no more dispense, nor release with the individual consecrated, by reason of the dignity or precedence of his order from his religious vows and obligations, than the order of Priesthood. This latter certainly raises the ordained much more in dignity above the laity, than consecra-

mission to contradict the holy Council of Florence, which teaches you, that plenary power was delivered by our Lord Jesus Christ to him (his Holiness) through Saint Peter of feeding, ruling, and governing the universal church. *Et ipsi in Beato Petro ascendendi, regendi, atque gubernandi universam ecclesiam a Domino Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse.* When again he tells you, that he does * “most distinctly profess his full and deliberate conviction, “that no appointment to an Irish Bishoprick can be “legitimate in the present state of Europe, without “the free election of the diocesan clergy assembled “in chapter for that purpose, after the Bishop’s death, “*vacante*

tion raises the Bishop above the Priest. The institution of religious orders in the church is a collateral, but very substantial proof, that all spiritual jurisdiction. is vested primarily and potentially in the Sovereign Pontiff. His authority alone can give efficacy to the vow made by the religious of obedience to their superior (Abbot, Prior, Guardian, Rector, General, or Provincial) and charge the superior with the cure of the souls of his religious, within and independently of the ordinary episcopal jurisdiction of the diocese, in which the religious establishment is formed. All these things are now, as little dependent of, or cognizable by the *civil magistrate*, as they were, whilst they proceeded above ground from the immediate hands of the Apostles during their lives, or were continued underground in the catacombs by their immediate successors avoiding persecution; or as they have for the last three centuries been redintegrated and restored to the primitive usages and institutions in the persecuted church of Ireland.

* 3 Col. 13.

“*vacante sede.*” And that neither the election of
 “Bishops by the Pope, nor their confirmation by
 “him after election, nor even his knowledge of the
 “appointment, is a necessary requisite to establish the
 “validity of any of these acts.”* In a word, when he
 favours his countrymen with a new *recipe* for *Bishop-*
making independently of the head of the Church, by
 telling them, † “that the election of the clergy with
 “the approbation of the gentry, and the confirma-
 “tion of the civil power, is the only prudent, the only
 “wise, the only constitutional, and the only *Catholic*
 “plan, that in the present circumstances, can be adopt-
 “ed by the Irish people.” Again call for the proofs of
 his mission to withdraw your assent and submission
 from the decrees of the Council of Trent, which has
 pronounced anathema against every one, who shall say,
 that the Bishops, who are set over dioceses, who are
 promoted (confirmed or instituted) by the authority
 of the Roman Pontiff, are not legitimate or true Bish-
 ops. ‡ *Si quis dixerit episcopos, qui Romani Pontificis Auc-*
toritate assumuntur, non esse legitimos & veros episcopos,
ANATHEMA SIT. I shall close this important
 subject with the opinion of a very great man (who
 died A.D. 420,) St. Jerome, which must have double
 effect upon your Reverence, as you have informed
 us

* 1 Col. 80. † 1 Col. 79.

‡ Conc. Trid. ses. 23. 2 Col. ix. He goes on, *or that of St.*
Bernard, little reflecting how St. Bernard's doctrine (p. 306)
 confounds that of the usurper of his name.

us, that after the name of Columbanus, your modesty would have assumed that of this Holy father, from his enmity to the intrigues of Popes and Nuncios, because he distinguished *the abuses of Courts*, and the superstitions of the vulgar from the genuine doctrine of the Catholic church. “Were I to chuse the name of any other great man, I would prefer that of St. Jerome for the same reason.” Writing against *Jovinian*, a recreant, dissolute, and Anti-papal Cænobite of Milan, who like most schismatics or seceders from communion with the See of Rome, equalizes all Bishops, both in order and jurisdiction, because Christ immediately gave both order and jurisdiction to all the Apostles, he says,* “But the Church, say you, “is founded upon Peter, although the very “same thing is elsewhere attributed to all the Apostles, and they all received the keys of the kingdom “of Heaven, and the support of the Church depends “upon them all in common? Yet nevertheless “amongst the twelve, one is made choice of, and “made head of the rest, to take away all occasion “of schism.”

Columbanus's further errors about the Pope and the Hierarchy.

I remark, Rev. and most learned Doctor, that you have the genuine cant, puff, and pretensions of all reformers.† “My book, has had in Ireland a rapid “sale.” ‡ “No one has laboured more than I have, “to rescue from oblivion the monuments of our ancient

* Hier. Adv. Jov. L. 11. † 2 Col. 3. ‡ 2 Col. 161.

“cient history,” viz. by dipping them into the Poddle. * “Each of the accumulated charges against me

* The sole apology I offer to my reader for so frequently resorting to the disgusting task of inculpation, is Columbanus’s unceasing recurrence to his own correctness, knowledge, and importance. He is truly *lucus a non lucendo*. In addition to several sentiments of his worthy grandfather providentially preserved from their intended suffocation in the Poddle, is a letter from him to his friend Mr. O’More, which contains an anticipated damnation of the last fifteen years of the grandson’s course. “The concern you express at the attack made
“on me for no other offence, but that of preferring in spiritu-
“als, obedience to the laws of conscience, rather than to the
“law of the strongest, is so natural to an honest mind, and so
“congenial even with that probity, which the elementary prin-
“ciples of reason dictated to the Pagans, that our masters
“cannot but feel it, and therefore cannot but be culpable in
“counteracting it. The infliction of civil punishment, where
“no civil crime exists, is a dispensation, which accords but lit-
“tle with that of Providence: since instead of annexing re-
“wards to sincerity, it transfers them to dissimulation, &c.”
Fitting is it also, that Irishmen of all persuasions should know, what Doctor Charles O’Conor, Member of the Academy of Cortona, thought and printed of his revered grandfather in 1795, of whom he says in 1812, (5 Col. 247) *he had not an historical disposition of mind, and I enter my solemn protest against his character of Lord Clarendon; and (p. 256) My late Grandfather’s statements, as far as they relate to Lord Clarendon, and to the persecutions of the reign of James down to 1641, are therefore exaggerated. I utterly reject my grandfather’s character of Clarendon’s history as declamatory and untrue. (p. 279) Amicus, Plato, Amicus Socrates, Sed magis amica veritas.* My reader will observe the select society, into which Columbanus has been initiated by the great

“ me is a *direct falsehood*.* If no other advantage
 “ should arise from Columbanus’s letters, but that
 of

man, whose very name in 1810 *he did not dare to mention*. (2 Col. 264) In 1812 he openly boasts of his friendly intimacy with Plato, Socrates and truth, and of his devoted obsequiousness to the admiration and firm hope of the nobility, gentry, clergy, and People of Ireland, the most noble the Marquis of Buckingham. Irishmen beware, and mark how in such company the intellects of your reformer have been brightened: how his morals have been mended. Before he had washed off the rouge, and had begun to bask in the warm beams of munificent patronage, the following was the portrait of his grandfather from a sketch taken from the life; a faint line of which, the admiring sympathy of a stranger endeavours to hand over to posterity in the frontispiece to this letter. After the still uninvigorated and uncheered member of the academy of Cortona, had set forth his grandfather’s thoughts and wishes to write a history of his country, he says: “ I have been often so much led away by
 “ this consideration, that I felt the loss of Mr. O’Conor’s in-
 “ tended History of Ireland to be more serious, than it would
 “ appear on first view. No man was better acquainted than
 “ he with the original sources of it. No man knew better the
 “ spirit of the parties, and of our clans before and after refor-
 “ mation. No man had laid himself out for such a task so ear-
 “ ly in life as he did. No man divided his company more be-
 “ tween Protestants and Catholics, between higher and lower
 “ orders. *No man scorned more to sacrifice historical truth on the*

* 3 Col. 143. This reminds us so strongly of Peter Walsh, to whom I have in the note of my last history assimilated Columbanus, that I take this opportunity of informing my reader, that he will find the paralel, as far as it goes, (for Columbanus has gone far beyond Walsh) in the Appendix, No. III.

“ of shewing, that a Catholic may, without ceasing
 “ to be a Catholic, argue against the abuses, which
 “ prevail in the Catholic Church, and arraign before
 “ the tribunal of the public, as St. Jerome did, the
 “ conduct of the episcopal order, and call them back
 “ to the general principles of their own Church, that
 “ alone will be an object sufficiently important to
 “ justify this appeal to our country and to our friends.
 “ * I feel it a duty I owe to the Catholic Church to
 “ lift up my feeble voice against false and pernicious
 “ maxims, which *I know* to be novel, uncanonical,
 “ and equally detrimental to the prosperity of our
 “ country, and to the interests of our religion, for
 “ which

2 U

“ *altars of prejudice.* And no man felt more sensibly the wrongs
 “ and calamities of his countrymen of all descriptions.” A
 tutelary cherub of Erin presided over the immersion of the me-
 moirs, and preserved some few copies with almost as singular a
 Providence, as watched over Moses in the flags of the Nile ;
 and preserved to his countrymen this golden principle of the
 grandfather doomed to paricidal oblivion by the degenerate
 grandson. “ *I know, that in my present situation I love truth more*
 “ *than I love any thing, and I think I could resign a crown sooner*
 “ *than resign my principles.*” Let this motto be magnificently
 atchieved in gold and emeralds (the half of a tellership of sixty
 thousand per annum will bear the expence) over the collection
 of Irish books and manuscripts in that *large and splendid library*,
 to which Columbanus, I presume, referred in his third Address,
 (p.50) as the supposed scene of an incident, that will never be
 credited, as long as it rests only upon *his ipse dixit*. Such a
post-liminious device to the *Stowe collection* will have its use.

* 3 Col 46.

“ which every principle of my education, all the
 “ study, and all the experience of my life call upon
 “ to spill, were it necessary, the last drop of my
 “ blood.” * “ That my opinions in private agree
 “ with my printed books ; that I am utterly incapa-
 “ ble of holding any doctrine in religion, which I
 “ would dare to disavow : and that base insinuations
 “ can never affect me, except with those, with whom
 “ I have no personal acquaintance, are matters of
 “ such notoriety, wherever I am known, that I would
 “ scorn to allude to them, did I not feel it an impe-
 “ rious duty to uphold my character with my coun-
 “ trymen.” † “ My reading has sufficiently inform-
 “ ed me, that in the regions of learning there are
 “ many intricacies, much darkness, and formidable
 “ confusion. In these mazes of opposite systems,
 “ and intricacies of learned opinions, I derive com-
 “ fort from the certainty, that in tracing back the
 “ steps of the venerable Synods and Councils of an-
 “ tiquity, I travel in company with all the wisdom,
 “ and all the virtue of eighteen hundred years.”
 † “ The great business of every man is to *enquire* di-
 “ ligently,

* 3 Col. 105. This *charle* of the travelling Knight for eigh-
 teen centuries seems to have had such charms on him, that he
 has favoured his countrymen with a voluntary *Da Capo*, with
 variations, the most striking of which is the encrease of his tra-
 velling retinue. (4 Col. 416.) First he is attended by *wisdom*,
 and *Virtue* ; then, by *Sanctity*, *Wisdom*, and *Learning*.

† 3 Col. 104.

“ligerly, when he is to form a judgment on mat-
 “ters relating to the character of such an ancient,
 “and so universal a church as the Catholic; to dis-
 “tinguish the abuses of individuals from the sanctity
 “of her canons: to reflect that individuals may
 “grow in knowledge without growing in humility or
 “virtue, that a heap of indigested and unselected
 “erudition operates but faintly in the regulation of
 “conduct, and that we may trust too much to our
 “own powers,, and be *too wise in our own conceits*.
 “For my part I love submission to venerable autho-
 “rity. I would respect the genuine decisions of the
 “ancient church, even if that church had no promi-
 “ses in her favor: I would feel reverence for her
 “instructions, even if they were in opposition to my
 “own acquirements.” * “There is also a degree of
 “coercion necessary to restrain the pruriency of hu-
 “man opinions, since experience shews, that a too
 “warm assertion, of the *right* of private judgment leads
 “to schisms in religion, and that that right, which can-
 “not be disputed, is frequently exercised without
 “knowledge, asserted with petulance, and vaunted
 “without discretion, until the bonds of peace are bro-
 “ken, and rancorous controversies, uncharitable ca-
 “lumnies, and unjustifiable altercations ensue. Far
 “be it from me therefore, very far to excite any spi-
 “rit of resistance to legitimate authority in the
 “church.” With all these plausible sentiments of
 2 U 2 reform,

* 4 Col. 15. † 3 Col. VI.

reform, how came your Reverence to hold back, and smother your zeal, whilst for about 30 years, you beheld these abominations defile the sanctuary? * “ Our
 “ Bishops, you say, are *intruders*, if they are not previously elected by the Clergy of each vacant See,”
 “ Those, who have been recently appointed to Irish
 “ Sees are illegitimate intruders, in direct violation
 “ of the canons of general councils, *non intraverunt*
 “ *per ostium in ovile*, usurpers in the eye of sanctity,
 “ violaters of the laws of the church.” To a genuine Catholic mind dreadful must be the consequences of a *pseudo-episcopacy* pervading an hierarchy. Your Reverence has alluded to some, and can be ignorant of none of them; it would be beyond the line of my department to insist upon them. But as an historian it behoves me to notice, when the grand ebullition of your punctilious zeal for the orthodoxy and discipline of the Catholic Church first burst forth: and it is somewhat important to trace it to the declining health of your late Bishop of Elphin, Doctor French, and the failure of the *Zebedean*† canvas for your succession

* It is impossible exactly to fathom or gauge the mind, motives, and views of the author, who writes for deceit: and I am free to charge him with that general intent, who boasts of his opponents inability to point out one proposition in all his works, *as heretical or schismatical*; and therefore, that he remains in possession of his orthodoxy. Columbanus will excuse my concluding, that the canvas for the See of Elphin, to which he was privy, was at least *Anti-Christian*, for our blessed Lord, though

cession to his See. Then and not before, like Cerberus you opened three tremendous mouths against

he reprimanded not the mother of the sons of Zebedee, who solicited their spiritual promotion, yet as the sons were present, he answered in the plural number, as if it were their joint application for it. *Ye know not what ye ask.* (Mat. 20. 22). Our Saviour did not grant the request; and evidently disapproved of the application for it. “*And when the ten heard it, they were moved with indignation against the two brethren.* It is remarkable, that neither Christ, nor the ten expressed any displeasure or indignation against the soliciting parent, but against those, in whose behalf, and with whose privity the solicitation was made. I cannot drop this subject without noticing some expressions of Columbanus, which bear internal evidence of the workings and bearings of his mind upon the object of his ambition. In his first letter (p. 21) he says with unwarrantable frowardness, and not without spite, “that there is no instance, and there ought “to be none, in the history of the Christian Church, in which “the Bishops of any Catholic country elected their own successors, or bequeathed their own dioceses, as the Bishops of “Ireland actually do, by their own private choice; a *private* “*arrangement*, in which Simony, for ought we know, but certainly favoritism, reasons of *flesh and blood*, and worldly propensities, must necessarily prevail against *honest exertions*.” And (3 Col. 16.) “It would be endless to enumerate the promotions, which have occurred in the Church of Ireland, thro’ “the interest of our gentry and nobility: (he then feelingly adds) “*And I, who have never had any such interest in my favor,* “*&c.*” Now, *honest exertions*, and *interest made in favour* of a person to procure a Bishopric for him, evidently could not have been thus spoken of by a person, who thought of any means, (even the most honourable, as was a direct application to our blessed Lord) to procure ecclesiastical preferment,

against the Pope, the Irish Bishops, and their coadjutors.

Rabida qui concitus ira
Implevit pariter ternis latratibus Auras,
Et sparsit virides spumis albentibus agros.

Through anger and madness you cause
The air with three yells to resound,
You poison with foam from your jaws
The green fields of Erin around.

OVID's Met. 7.

Columbanus's trick
in profess-
ing his sub-
mission to
the Pope

I have said something to you, Reverend and most learned Doctor, of your opposition to the Christian Primate and your own Hierarchy: I must say something also of coadjutors. Though redundant, it might not be improper here once for all to observe, for the sake of my Protestant readers, that if I have appeared to them to assume too much without proof in speaking of Roman Catholic doctrines, this letter is solely addressed to the Rev. Doctor Charles O'Connor, D. D. who professes himself to be a Roman Catholic of the very purest cast, and lays in extraordinary

as did our blessed Lord and ten of his Apostles. No such exertion or interest made in favor can be honest, if made or wished on behalf of the candidate himself: we have scriptural authority for calling them *Anti-Christian*, when made by others; and by general inference they are therefore to be reprobated: "A
" good man out of the good treasure of his heart bringeth forth
" that, which is good; and an evil man out of the evil treasure
" of his heart bringeth forth that, which is evil; for of the
" abundance of the heart his mouth speaketh." (Luke 6. 45.)

nary merit for his zealous support of the rights and dignities of the Holy See, *optime de sede Apostolica meretur*.* He is resolved to proclaim his orthodoxy on the house-tops, for the learned in the dead language, and in the English for the *fine nation*; but for poor *Irish honesty* he has not vouchsafed to give a version of it in his vernacular tongue, although the letter be written to his countrymen (nominally indeed to his brother) on the liberties of the *Irish* church. Of the great majority of the population of his country he elsewhere says, † *Stultorum infinitus est numerus*. As by the general discipline of the Catholic Church the divine service is performed in Latin, and in that language is the canon law written, I presume the Latin *formula* is intended for the theologians, and other learned men of his own Church, who might be expected to scrutinize it with punctilious rigor; and the loose English version for the gentlemen of the Established Church, upon whose sympathies he has some claims. A *jure divino* primacy in the Bishop of Rome is believed by every genuine Roman Catholic; we therefore find in the Latin *formula* these words *et Divina qua pollet auctoritas* applied to the Holy See: but as the Protestants admit of no primacy at all in the Bishop of Rome, they

* See this profession of faith in Latin and in English, Appendix, No. VII:

† 2 Col. 116. "Men must be content to leave these matters to the learned, as they leave prescriptions to Physicians and drugs to Apothecaries."

they cannot admit it to be of *divine right* in the Pope. What Columbanus calls translating into English is a complete disguise. A Catholic formulary in masquerade. He enters the lists with a Roman target, behind which he fancies his orthodoxy secure. When he has displayed the chivalrous feats of his third tournament, he anticipates the magical effects of them upon his spectators, and boldly ventures to pass off his English *nostrum*, as the genuine article first announced in the more imposing language of Rome. Judging probably, that those, who at the beginning of the work should have read the Latin, would not trouble themselves with the English version at the end of it. At all events, he fondly hoped, that the lecture of his instructions properly prepared them to relish the variance. Those, who understood not the dead language, would reserve themselves for the English treat at the close of the work. Thus was he doubly guarded against too severe and critical a comparison.* The

* As such barefaced infidelity of translation, and such gross attempts at delusion are scarcely credible, the Latin and English *formularies* are given together with some annotations in the Appendix, No. VII. As the closer affinity of the Latin tongue to the properties of the old Phœnician language, than to those of modern English was probably the reason for Columbanus's having announced his intention (as he did ten years ago) of translating the old Irish Annals into Latin, in order that his version might be the more chastely correct, I assume, that had his most learned Reverence professed his faith in his native tongue, the *formula* would have approached nearer to the Roman, than to the English text.

The system * of coadjutorships, whether newly in-
 troduced, whether only continued, or whether revived
 in church government, was a *brain-blow* to the am-
 bitious views of a clergyman, who could reflexedly
 speculate, and feelingly argue upon *honest exertions* to
 2 X attain

System of
 coadjutor-
 ship misre-
 presented.

* It has been the immemorial usage in the church to appoint *Chorepiscopi*, *Coadjutors*, or as they are frequently called *Suffragans*, not only in cases of age and infirmity, but where dioceses are very extensive, having merely a nominal jurisdiction *in partibus infidelium*, but having by consecration received episcopal order, who are employed in the dioceses of other Prelates to help them in performing such acts, as can only be done by the order of Bishops: such as conferring holy orders, consecrating altars, giving confirmation, &c. The propriety and canonical validity of such Bishops without jurisdiction, are strongly supported by the learned Protestant author (supposed to be Bishop Fleetwood) of *The account of Church Government and Church Governors* published at the beginning of the last century, throughout his 12th chapter. He quotes very largely and rests his doctrine upon the authority of another very learned Protestant canonist *Beveridge* Bishop of St. Asaph, who wrote *Pandectæ Canonum Apostolorum & Conciliorum* published in two volumes in folio. A. D. 1678. He kept up a very long and interesting correspondence with *Bossuet* Bishop of Meaux: he wrote with profound learning and exemplary modesty. For which two attainments, if *Columbanus* be not incurable, I recommend the lecture of that work. *Columbanus's* flippant and frequent jactitation of extensive reading (*my old friend, Doctor Curry, who, had he read half as much as I have, 2 Col 241, & alib.*) brings to my mind the practical good sense, with which my school-master inculcated to his scholars, the maxim, *lege multum, non multa*. Read much, but few books.

attain a mitre, and publicly lament, *that through the influence of gentry and nobility he had never had any such interest made in his favor. Hinc illæ lachrymæ!* Fully I can account for the bitterness of your Reverence's complaints and reproaches upon this tender subject; but I find no *Irish* honesty, no fidelity of the annalist, no learning of the canonist, no edification of the Priest in the false indecent suggestions and charges made by you against a most respectable body of Prelates. I stand aghast at the malignity, I pity the absurdity of your ravings; *rabida qui concitus ira.* † “ You say, that
 “ to question the divine right of each Bishop to be-
 “ queath his diocese, to whom he pleases, is to in-
 “ cur the danger of excommunication: and that their
 “ Lordships the Bishops will resist every attempt to
 “ infringe on this right, and will exhort the people
 “ also to suffer martyrdom in defence of it. *Bravo!*
 “ Intriguing Bishops agree, that they can nominate
 “ their own successors against the decrees of gene-
 “ ral councils, and render their dioceses hereditary
 “ property, or bequeath them to whom they list for
 “ reasons *best known to themselves.*” After the can-
 vas for the reversionary See of Elphin, and all *honest exertions* had failed, you affect to argue *ab impossibili.*
 “ How then could I canvas for a situation, that pro-
 “ fessed to engage me to co-operate with men, who
 “ are stated to have avowed their determination to
 “ reject the Gallican liberties, and who thereby, in
 “ my

* 1 Col. 16.

† 2 Col. 213.

‡ 3 Col. 7, 8.

“ my opinion sacrifice the true interests of the Ca-
 “ tholic religion in Ireland, and the emancipation of
 “ their country to a corrupt and novel system, to
 “ views of exclusive dominion and of private in-
 “ trigue. The pain I feel on this account is increas-
 “ ed by their *unprecedented, uncanonical* claim to ex-
 “ clusive power in the very important point of *nomi-*
 “ *nating their own successors* : a practice, which ren-
 “ ders their dioceses private property, disposable at
 “ their will, and establishes the empire of world'y
 “ succession, *ex voluntate carnis & et sanguinis & ex*
 “ *voluntate viri*, in the very sanctuaries of the Isle of
 “ Saints !” * “ There must be an end of *private in-*
 “ *trigues* carried on by nepotism and favouritism
 “ during the life of the Bishop *pro tempore* : and we
 “ must see restored that ordinance relating to the
 “ appointment of Bishops, which is insisted on by
 “ Pope Celestine I. who sent Saint Patrick into Ire-
 “ land in 1432.” † “ The Catholic religion, *as pro-*
 “ *fessed in Ireland*, can never be represented by the
 “ body of our clergy, as long as our church is under
 “ the influence of a *foreign power*, as long as our Bi-
 “ shops intrigue for preferment in foreign courts, as
 “ long as our church government is managed by ex-
 “ *clusive* Synods, and our second order of clergy,
 “ nobility, and gentry are deprived of their necessa-
 “ controul ; that to remedy the abuses which prevail,
 “ our Bishops must be elected, as formerly, without

2 X 2

“ any

* 3 Col. 47.

† 3 Col. 141.

“ any canvassing and intriguing on their parts by the
 “ Dean and Chapter of each vacant See.” * “ Am I
 “ therefore to submit to the most daring violations
 “ of the Canons? To the bequeathing of Dioceses?
 “ To the uncanonical, perhaps, the *Simoniacal* ap-
 “ pointment of favourites to episcopal Sees? To the
 “ vilifying of the second order of the Priesthood?
 “ To the *excluding and absolute monarchy principles* now
 “ introduced into the Church? Why has not Doc-
 “ tor Poynter’s zeal been displayed in combating
 “ these abuses? because he has been uncanonically
 “ appointed himself.” “ Inquire—Inquire—Have I
 “ not elsewhere shewn, that not even the Pope can
 “ nominate his own successor.” † “ I will not now
 “ enquire, whether it is wise, at a time, when all the
 “ feudal establishments of Europe have been levelled,
 “ and all feudal ideas have expired, to attempt to
 “ force upon us, by such falsehoods, a feudal church
 “ government of twenty-five Spiritual Lords, who
 “ having no legitimate children to inherit their dio-
 “ ceses, claim a right of adopting children and be-
 “ queathing to those adopted favorites all the clergy
 “ of their dioceses, as the proprietors of West India
 “ lands bequeath, or sell, or dispose of their black
 “ slaves without any controul.”

Actual mo-
 tives for
 Columba-
 nus’s oppo-
 sition to co-
 adjutor-
 ships. j

Now, Reverend and most learned Doctor, that
 you have moral certainty, that none of your *honest ex-
 ertions*, no interest made in your favor through the
 influence

* 4 Col. 29.

† 1 Col. 78.

influence of your *gentry and nobility*, no recommendation of those Irish Prelates, to whom you formerly applied and corresponded with in consequence, no postulation of the diocesan clergy of Elphin, no interference of your great and anonymous patron, no countenance from those enlightened statesmen, who have emerged from their erroneous conceptions of the *Veto*, no state influence from an intolerant ministry, no assistance of Doctor Walsh at Paris, no favor of Cardinal Maury at Rome will procure you a Catholic Mitre in Ireland, deign to retrace in your cooler thoughts those ravening effusions from the defeated projects of your spiritual ambition. Well do you know, that no nepotism, no favoritism, no simony, no issue legitimate or illegitimate, no spirituality of flesh and blood, no bequest of a diocese have ever *de facto* existed amongst the Irish Catholic Hierarchy within your Reverence's recollection or experience; neither had any such imputation or charge proceeded from you, until the canvas for the reversionary mitre of Doctor French had failed; and if it had succeeded, probably none ever would. Your consciousness, however, of those particular negatives, is not the ground, upon which I reprobate the expressions of your angry feelings. Were there truth in your assertion of facts, or grounds for your illiberal and indecent suggestions, the principles, which regulate and controul the facts and circumstances, that form the general subject of your five Letters, would have the same

same force and efficacy upon my mind.* In concluding this letter, which has grown under my pen to a size

* I was induced to publish this letter to Columbanus, not only to repel his groundless and illiberal attack upon my historical veracity, but to elucidate, verify and confirm whatever I have advanced, or inferred in that history by collateral, newly discovered, recent or subsequent facts and circumstances. One of the most astonishing and perplexing *phænomena* in the political system of the British empire, is the sudden shifting, dropping or dissembling of principle in most of the professed, inflexible and conscientious opponents of Catholic Emancipation. The report of the debate on Mr. Canning's motion for the House's taking early in the next Session into its most serious consideration the state of the Laws affecting his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects, &c, which was carried by a majority of 129 out of 391 members, on the 22nd of June 1812, affords more materials, than many volumes of ancient history, for justly appreciating the honor and honesty, the sincerity and consistency, the wisdom and experience of most of our modern statesmen and politicians.

No inconsiderable part of this letter tends to fix certain persons in England with a very indefatigable, though not very open attempt to let in the *Veto*, and *nationalize* the Catholic Church: in plain words, to *establish Bishops* appointed by the laity, and not drawing spiritual jurisdiction from the See of Rome. The reader, who takes an interest in this question, in a note (p. 790. 3d vol.) of my *Post Union History*, will find, that I say, "The influence of the English Vetoists
" upon some of the supposed parliamentary friends of the
" Catholic cause has been very recently manifested in the
" House of Commons by the amphibious speech of Sir J. C.
" Hippeley on the 31st of May 1811." That note specified the honorable Baronet's boast to the House of his having been

a size, I little at first expected, I shall, under theological correction endeavour shortly to develope as the necessary

in correspondence with, attended and instructed by Mr. Butler. He read the proceedings of the committee of English Catholics in 1791 and 1792 : of course he was furnished by his correspondent with the *blue books* (for some account of which vide App. No. IV) and unquestionably he was well impregnated with their spirit. My reference to them in this letter will scarcely therefore be considered a *hors d'œuvre*. The magic powers of the two grand co-operators for the *Veto and arrangements*, Columbanus and Mr. Butler, so worked upon the honorable Baronet, that they brought him to an open and unequivocal avowal of his present actual views upon the Catholic body. I find the following as the the most ample and diffuse report of the part he took in the debate.

“ Sir J. C. Hippesley was of opinion, that some security
 “ was necessary : at the same time, it was not his wish to
 “ encroach on the Catholic church. But he could shew, that
 “ the church itself was tired of a foreign yoke. He had a
 “ communication from a Catholic Prelate, stating, that it was
 “ necessary to guard against the intrigues of Rome ; also
 “ from an Archbishop of Ireland, that a foreign bishop had
 “ been appointed to his district, by the Pope without his the
 “ Archbishop's knowledge. He wished the Irish Catholics to
 “ be on the same footing, as those of Spain and Portugal,
 “ for which reason the measure should have his support.”

Irishmen and Englishmen, who do not feel yourselves oppressed by a foreign yoke, because your spiritual pastors draw their jurisdiction from the Vicar of Christ, be aware of what you seek, and of what you take. Demand proof of these complaints of a Catholic Prelate, and the appointment of a foreign Bishop in an ecclesiastical province in Ireland. Mistrust both the instructors and instructed. *I bid defiance name,*

necessary consequences of the premises, which I have heretofore endeavoured to state with fairness and precision. In

name (5. Col. 13) I truly told you in the 3d volume of my last history (p. 794) that “the deep laid plan (of Veto and “arrangements) was suggested by Sir J. C. Hippesley, fathered by Mr. Pitt, adopted by Lord Grenville, and palmed “by Lord Castlereagh upon the duped or intimidated trustees “of Maynooth in contemplation of Union.” But it appears from a short pamphlet of 12 pages, without name or title, dated London, April 15, 1796, (the first printed effort of Sir J. C. Hippesley in favor of the Pope and Catholics after his return from Italy) that before the Union was known to be in contemplation, this plan for altering the state of the Catholics was actually on the *tapis*. Irishmen will not be the more partial to it, for its having been devised by the authors of the the system of coercion and terror, immediately after the virtuous Fitz-William had been so infamously sacrificed to the Protestant Ascendancy party. *He* sincerely wished to give religious freedom to the country unconditionally. The honorable Baronet opened his pleadings on behalf of Rome in the following manner. “In consequence of the proceedings “of the infatuated people in some parts of Ireland called “*Defenders*, reports have been circulated highly injurious to “the Court and See of Rome, and which if unchecked, may “*hereafter be destructive to many salutary arrangements of civil “policy intimately connected with the interests of his Majesty’s “Government.*” From that period to the present has he never lost sight of these *civil arrangements*, though in the intermediate time he appears frequently either to have changed or very clumsily to have disguised his sentiments, concerning the relations of his Majesty’s Catholic subjects with the Roman Pontiff. We must mark the progress of those *Vetoists and arrangers* over the minds of those, they fasten upon. In

In urging the divine origin and the absolute independence of civil and temporal power, it is admitted, that they are both to be exercised by human beings, naturally imperfect and fallible; consequently liable

Diocesan election of postulation not absolutely necessary for the real appointment of Bishops by the Pope

2 Y

to

1805, alluding to an opinion entertained by some, "that his Majesty instead of the *See of Rome* should in future nominate to the vacant Sees of Bishops of the Roman Communion," he explicitly said, "I conceive, Sir, neither the Catholics could consistently concede such an innovation, nor could his Majesty consistently assume such an unprecedented exercise of power" (Vide. Substance of additional observations intended to have been delivered, &c. published by himself): Yet after he had been worked upon by his new instructors, he says, "all confirm the principle, that the Sovereign power in every state of whatever religious communion has considered itself armed with legitimate authority in all matters of ecclesiastical arrangements within its dominions." (Vid. 3d vol. of my last history 794) In his speech in 1810 he declares open war against his old friend and confidential correspondent Dr. Milner, and declares himself professedly for *Veto and arrangements*. In 1811, he declares, that, "as long, as he has a seat in that House he shall never consent to any bill without a clause, in pursuance of those resolutions of the committee of the English Catholics:" but he had then so amalgamated his feelings with those of their former Secretary, that in mentioning the instructive letter he had lately received from Mr. Butler, he feelingly added, *against whom Dr. Milner had within the course of a few days printed in Dublin as foul a libel, as ever issued from the press*. This publication is alluded to (5 Col. 110) as a pompously announced *Oglio and dab* with a prefix of D.D.F.J.A.C. R. A. V. A. in which the writer informs us, that he is an *Apostolical Mastiff*, modestly insinuates, that he is the Jerom

to error, neglect and abuse in the exercise.* But occasional imperfections, defects, or even vices, in the of modern times, and allows his Editor, that is himself to bespatter him with fulsome adulation: and all this by a sympathizing

* Never having studied divinity, I am the more anxious to express myself with clearness and precision beyond cavil or doubt, whenever there arises a necessity of touching upon a theological subject. On retrospect to the note, p. 260, it may be doubted, whether I have expressed my meaning with full and correct precision in saying, that the *power conferred by ordination of uttering the words of consecration and absolution as the Minister of God, to which such supernatural effects are annexed by the divine power, can neither be recalled nor suspended by any power upon earth with or without reason.* My meaning (speaking under theological correction) is, that the effect (or as I was taught in my catechism to call it, the invisible grace) of the sacrament of order affixed to the person ordained an indelible character and power, which none not ordained could possess, which no power on earth could efface, extinguish, or annihilate even for an hour; he cannot be unpriested. I before observed, that as the common law of England was founded on the orthodox creed of our ancestors upon faith and church government, so we may learn from Bracton, who was a most respectable Judge under Henry II, in the thirteenth century, that the civil magistrate cannot degrade clergymen, because he cannot give them orders, *Nec clericos degradare quia non potest eos ad ordines promovere.* I meant merely to assert, that there are no human means of undoing that, which was effected by the external sign of that sacrament, viz. the imposition of hands by the Bishop. But the two powers, namely, of consecration and absolution, though conferred potentially and radically by the sacrament of ordination, differ in some sort from each other. The power of consecrat-

the exercise change not their own nature or effects?
 I avoid putting extreme cases, which are generally
 2 Y 2 more

sympathizing D.D. a Member of the Academy of Cortona, the illuminator of benighted Ierna (4. Col. 18), who assumed the name of *Columbanus* because he was a sincere Catholic, an enemy to the intrigues of Popes and Nuncios, &c. and who
 were

ing the elements involves no second person ; it is therefore presumed, that if a Priest interdicted, or suspended, should be so abandoned, as to celebrate the mass, and pronounce the words of consecration, though he would sin grievously by such sacrilegious conduct, yet the elements would be really consecrated. In the other case, or power of retaining and remitting sin, the exercise of it is a judicial act, and the Priest must necessarily have a subject to work upon, and without jurisdiction he can have none : therefore, as in the regular exercise of that power a second person is necessarily implicated, namely the penitent, a Priest under interdict or suspension (I presume the same of any Priest in orders without jurisdiction) cannot validly absolve. Even Columbanus allows, that without mission, there can be no valid administration of the sacraments. So the power of absolution, though vested potentially and irrevocably in the Priest by virtue of his ordination is yet incomplete in him without jurisdiction ; for without jurisdiction there can be no subject, upon whom the power can be validly exercised. I have ever understood (still I speak under theological correction) that in extreme cases, & *in articulo mortis*, where a person having regular mission or jurisdiction cannot be had, the church out of tender regard to the consciences of all her children, allows, that an interdicted or suspended Priest, or one having no jurisdiction, might validly absolve a sincerely penitent Christian confessing under circumstances of such extreme urgency.

more invidious, than instructive. Mutual encroachments and usurpations upon each other have been too frequently

he to chuse the name of any other great man, would prefer that of St. Jerome for the same reason; and who permitted Dodesley his intended Editor in 1803, to besmear him with the most nauseating flattery. (Vid. App. p. 12.) Before Columbanus was personally acquainted with Sir J. C. Hip-
pesley he spoke of him in 1810 (1. Col. 115), as of a man,
“ who with the best intentions, had yet to learn the whole
“ extent and calculate the different bearings of a subject,
“ which involves the divine and ecclesiastical rights of the
“ second order of the Irish clergy, as well as the first, and
“ embraces even the civil rights of the Irish people.” This
charge of ignorance, the Hon. Baronet, who not unreasonably
felt himself entitled to *benefit of clergy* (especially of the *Irish clergy*) took in high dudgeon; but yet consoled himself with
ignoring in good and holy company. (Substance of Speech 89)
“ If Sir J. Hippesley appears to Columbanus to be ignorant of
“ those rights, so must the ten Prelates, who made the propo-
“ sal of 1799.” Columbanus was more disposed to inculcate
the Prelates, than their boasted advocate. It was no reply to
his charge. The sympathies of the *duo laborantes in Unum* soon
made common cause in engaging the Honorable Baronet as an
open and professed, as they knew he would be an indefatigable
and powerful advocate of their Anti-Papal views. His *palinodia*
appeared in his last Address (5 Col. 131) “ Before I had the
“ honour of a personal acquaintance with that invaluable friend
“ to religious, as well as to civil liberty, Sir John Cox Hip-
“ pesley, I ventured to say of him, without meaning, heaven
“ knows, any thing inconsistent with the high respect I feel
“ for his integrity, with the best intentions, &c.” The reader
of Columbanus, who refers with inverted commas by way of
quotation from one part of his work to another, will obviously

frequently and too flagrantly made. Yet not even actual abuse, much less, the possibility of abuse in the exercise

expect the quotation to be faithful, and will therefore probably not turn back to it, on the credit he gives a gentleman for fidelity. It falls to my painful duty to warn *my* readers of the barefaced infidelity of quotation even of his own words, which in this instance wholly metamorphose the text referred to, viz.

“not with Sir John Hippesley, who with the best intentions
“has yet to learn the whole extent, and to calculate the different bearings of a subject, which involves the divine and ecclesiastical rights of the Second order of the Irish Clergy, as well as of the first, and embraces even the civil rights of the Irish people.” What different idea, judgment and feeling must not arise in the mind even of the most prejudiced or bigotted, who reads the words referred to marked as quotation?

“who with the best intentions had yet to learn the *whole extent*,
“and to calculate the *different bearings* of the Catholic question.”

Columbanus perhaps from his own habits presumes, that readers seldom return to, or reflect upon the text, over which they have thrown a rapid, uninterested, or reluctant eye. It is evident, that if the Catholic question were this day carried, in other words, if Ireland were this day emancipated, the relative *spiritual* rights, powers, and jurisdiction of the Catholic Bishops and Priests, would remain precisely as they now are, and as they were in the first age of Christianity, when Saint Ignatius said *Sine Episcopo nemo quidquam faciet eorum, quæ ad Ecclesiam spectant* (*Anteu* 311).

I should with extreme reluctance be placed in the painful situation of being forced out of the favourable convictions concerning Sir J. C. Hippesley, under which I wrote the note (3d Vol. p. 835) in my Post Union History. “No, he never acted upon disguised principles. The candor, that pervades this whole speech, the instruction it conveys, the utility of it

exercise can conceal or confound the line of demarcation between the two powers. Your Reverence has with

“ to the Catholic cause, place him above such imputation. With
 “ the best intentions, however, of acting up to the fair principles of religious freedom, it is feared, that advantage has been
 “ taken of his easy access, of his avidity for information, of his
 “ reluctance to place to the account of dissimulation, what can
 “ be accounted for upon no other principles.” He has been
set and plied by the author of the *blue books*, and the author of Columbanus’s five Letters or Addresses to the Irish. *Duo laborantes in Unum*. They have obtained a short-lived triumph over him for their own designs : and he has been misled by false information, imposed on by insidious misrepresentation, and seduced by specious argument, to declare in open Senate, *that the Church itself was tired of a foreign yoke ; that a Catholic Prelate had assured him it was necessary to guard against the intrigues of Rome ; and that an Irish Archbishop had complained, that a foreign Bishop had been appointed to his district by the Pope without his knowledge*. But for the plausibility of consistency, he ushered in these novel and strange declarations from behind a *Richerian* shield borrowed for the occasion. *It is not my wish to encroach on the Catholic Church*. These two authors of blue books and addresses, also *set and plied* Lords Grey and Grenville, and for a time vauntingly chuckled at *an ephemeral triumph from illusion*. (*Vid. Antea*. from p. 246 to 254) By misrepresentation, deception, and importunity they were made *Vetsists* : and so were Messrs. Ponsonby, Grattan, and some others ; all of whom upon retracing the means, the grounds, the pretexts, the designs, the effects of their having been worked into this erroneous conviction, *like wise and enlightened statesmen, they retracted their former opinions, when they discovered them to be unjust and unpolitical*. *Cum ventum ad verum est, mores sensusque rebugnant*. I shall not anticipate an excuse from Sir John C. Hippley to

with studied affectation industriously avoided mentioning in any one of your five numbers the opinions
either

a pressing invitation to meet Lords Grey and Grenville, and Messrs. Ponsonby and Grattan and other friends, on the score of a pre-engagement to the Secretary of the would-be *Protesting Catholic Dissenters*, and a member of the Academy of Cortona.

In point of historical credit to be given to the facts asserted, or at least generally referred to, or assumed by Sir J. C. Hippesley in his last speech, I trust, he will not be offended at my professing a thorough conviction of his well disposed and unsuspicious mind having been most maliciously practised upon with a view of giving a final triumph to the *Richerian* views and manœuvres of the last twenty years for *nationalizing* the Catholic Churches of England and Ireland. I for one withhold assent and credit to any one of the three facts: I will jealously scrutinize the evidence, whenever it is brought forth: hitherto none has been tendered. Lord Redesdale long has been, and still is the professed friend, the confidential adviser, the powerful promoter of Mr. Butler's views and designs in all the Parliamentary proceedings relating to the subject matter of the blue books, and its immediate and remote possible consequences. His Lordship in 1805, in the debate on Lord Grenville's motion for referring the Petition of the Irish Catholics to a Committee, held the following language: but he named not the author of his information, neither did he refer the house to any path, stream, or direction, by which they might discover the source of that great body, which like the Nile traverses and occasionally overwhelms whole kingdoms. The Honourable Baronet leads his auditors no nearer to the inscrutable source in 1812, than the Right Hon. Baron did in 1805. (Vide my Post Union History 2d Vol. p. 97) "If the Catholic Hierarchy," said his Lordship, "were abolished, something might be done, to conciliate the Catholic body; and to the generality of that body,

either of others, or of yourself, in whom *spiritual jurisdiction* eminently and permanently resides, so as to be imparted

“ he was confident, the abolition of the Hierarchy would be
 “ extremely grateful. He had heard of a province, where the
 “ inferior clergy, one and all deprecated the appointment of a
 “ Bishop amongst them; and several reputable and intelligent
 “ Catholics had assured his Lordship, they would be glad to
 “ get rid of their Bishops.” Irishmen and Englishmen, who
 mean to retain communion with the supreme head and center
 of the Church, mark the destructive progress of, and firmly make
 head against this inundation of *Calvino Jansenian Anti-Prelacy*.
 Let it not in upon the vineyard. This general, incredible,
 and unsubstantiated declaration of Lord Redesdale obviously
 suggests, that the whole of the Hon. Baronet’s complaint was
 entirely of British manufacture. *He could shew, that the Church*
itself was tired of a foreign yoke: perhaps by reading Columbanus,
 or the blue books: but what means he by *the Church*, to which
a foreign yoke is grievous? *Qui versatur generalibus, versatur do-*
losè. The communication from a Catholic Prelate, stating, that it
 was necessary to guard against the intrigues of Rome, obviously
 appears from the wording of the report to have been *no immedi-*
ate communication; every party is anonymous: and of the person,
 through whom the communication was stated to the Honourable
 Baronet, who has filled such an extraordinary diplomacy to this
 intriguing court, I cordially repeat, *Hunc tu Romane Caveto*.
 Tread cautiously in the dark. Also from an Arch Bishop, that a
 foreign Bishop had been appointed to his district by the Pope without
 his knowledge. This metropolitical plaint appears also to have
 arrived to the Honourable Baronet by means of a statement. I
 question not, but that each of the three Irish Archbishops now
 living, will readily stand forth to negative the fact and com-
 plaint. The use of the word *district* superadds to the argument
 of the non-appearance of the *foreign Bishop* to take possession of

imparted to individuals, as the spiritual exigencies of the church shall occasionally require. Your insidi-

2 Z

ous

his See, that was a British *stating*, for the ecclesiastical limits of the episcopal jurisdiction in England are always termed *Districts*. No Irishman, and least of all an Archbishop would mention the boundaries of his own or suffragans jurisdiction, but in the terms, *provinces or dioceses*.

In the before-mentioned note relating to the Honorable Baronet, it is said : “ it is the amiable foible of the ingenuous and “ sincere to be unsuspicious and unguarded against deception “ and intrigue, to be prodigal of their credit to others, as in so- “ cial intercourse, they deal in no other, than the medium of “ undisguized truth.” Sir John Cox Hippenley, as I observed in the third volume of my last history (665) “ during Mr. Pitt’s “ administration spent some years in Rome under a secret mis- “ sion of unavowed diplomacy to the Roman Pontiff.” This he verifies in the supplementary appendix to the substance of his speech, &c. p. 117, in these words, “ It is scarcely consistent “ with the dignity of a great government to receive occasional “ benefits through private and unaccredited channels, where a “ regular diplomatic communication is held to be proscribed, “ and to enter into clandestine engagements, to which the pub- “ lic faith is as irrevocably pledged, as if they were sanctioned “ by the most punctilious formalities of office.” To this he puts a note. *Such engagements Sir J. C. Hippenley was author- ized to enter into with the court of Rome.* In the same page he calls the *legal* inhibitions of such intercourse, *weak, mischievous, and ridiculous*. The Hon. Baronet of all his Majesty’s *Protes- tant* subjects knows most of, and has spoken most openly, can- didly, and favourably both of the See and Court of Rome. I have never discovered an idea written, or uttered by him on any occasion, that was distrustful, contemptuous, or hostile to the Roman Pontiff, until he stood up in his place, in the House

ous intent to keep out of sight the primary jurisdiction of the See of Rome is but too obvious: but
 you

of Commons, on the 22d of June, 1812, warped and inoculated with the *papaphobia* by the two great practitioners in that art, who from their success in England, are preparing to introduce their system into Ireland,* and throughout the rest of the British empire, as extensively as the vaccination of Doctor Jenner. The fruits of their labours upon the delicate sensibilities of the Hon. Baronet for the Pope and the Pretender, are passing strange. His conversion into one of the strongest alarmists at the intrigues of Rome is almost as miraculous, as that of Saul. This gentleman, when in his diplomatic character at Rome, commanded the love and admiration of all, who had the happiness of being acquainted with him, of which he was so sensible, that in 1800 he distributed among his friends a most superb edition in quarto, of his negociations and correspondence with the Pope and Cardinals on the occasion of his procuring from his Majesty, an allowance of 4000l. per annum to the Cardinal of York, with *fac similes* of the great men's letters to Sir John Cox Hippesley. A letter of the 26th of February, 1800, from Cardinal Borgia acknowledges the gratitude and admiration of the whole conclave (consisting of thirty-four Cardinals) into which Mr. Oakly was admitted with letters from Lord Minto, (then at Vienna) with the official announce of the allowance to the Cardinal of York: "and in the applause, the names of
 " those, who assisted in promoting it re-echoed, and especially
 " that of my friend Sir John Hippesley, the principal mover of this
 " good action." The present Pope Pius VII. thus expressed himself to Sir John Hippesley in a letter written to him in the year 1800. "And as the above-mentioned glorious Sovereign
 " Pontiff (whose authority is of the greatest weight with us his
 " creature, and to whom we are bounden by the strongest and
 " sweetest ties of veneration, affection, and gratitude) has

* Where the Doctor is reported to be lately arrived.

you pitiably betray both your weakness and your malice. You have repeatedly admitted, that the ju-

2 Z 2

risdiction

“ given us so many and such manifest proofs of the high esteem
 “ he entertained of the generous English nation, and of its mag-
 “ nanimous and just government, and was ever so solicitous to
 “ cultivate harmony and friendship, and also to demonstrate
 “ to that nation, on all occasions, his most lively attachment,
 “ we also pursuing the same steps, will equally make it our
 “ study to preserve with jealous care the same reciprocal good
 “ intelligence and union : and we will not suffer (as far as lies
 “ in our power), that England should find seated in the Ponti-
 “ fical Chair of Rome another Pontiff differing from him, who
 “ so invariably acknowledged the kindness and friendship, that
 “ England entertained for him.” Such are the blessed effects
 of the Hon. Baronet being *set and plied* by these two zealots for
 antipapacy : *duo laborantes in Unum*. In 1800 he displays with
 ostentatious boast his correspondence with his Holiness ; and
 in 1810, when that same virtuous Prelate is a strict prisoner
 in the fortress of Savona, he stands up in his place in the House
 of Commons to sound the *tocsin* against the intrigues and en-
 croachments of Rome, and the grievances of a foreign yoke.
 It certainly is not too much to say, that of all the 1021 sena-
 tors, of which our two houses of Parliament consist, Sir John
 Cox Hipplesley is the very last, from whom these alarms would
 have been expected. Before however, he had been so worked
 upon, he seems to have been insensible of an hoax played upon
 him. For in the before-mentioned publication of 1796, he
 thus expressed himself (p. 1) “ The conviction of a man of the
 “ name of Levery at the last Belfast assizes for administering
 “ an oath *to be true to the Duke of York and his Committee*, has
 “ been cited, as a presumption, that there is still a considera-
 “ ble remnant of persons active in the desperate cause of re-
 “ storing the proscribed family of Stuart, and probably finding

jurisdiction of each Bishop, and of each Parish Priest is confined to his respective diocese and parish. The

“ abettors at Rome. On such an occasion, it seems an act of
 “ strict justice to refer to authentic documents, which suffi-
 “ ciently manifest the anxiety of the See of Rome for the peace
 “ and good order of these kingdoms.” And of such documents
 the pamphlet is made up, or refers to: namely, a brief of
 “ Pius VII. to the Bishop of Leon, then in London; the letters
 “ of the congregation of the *Propaganda* to the Catholic Cler-
 “ gy in his Majesty’s dominions; the Pastoral Instruction of
 “ Archbishop Troy; and the full account of the change of the
 “ Oath of Consecration, by the omission of the words *Hæreticos*
persequar & impugnabo: which has appeared so important to
 the Hon. Baronet, that he has thrice repeated it in different
 parts of his works. It is given in the Appendix, No. X.

The case of *Lever* was communicated to Sir John C. Hip-
 pesley by a private letter from Ireland: but it came from a
 quarter, which to him appeared of so much consequence, as to
 take him to press, and give a beginning to the many curious
 and interesting publications and rare documents in favor of the
 Roman Pontiff and his spiritual subjects within the British em-
 pire, with which the public (or rather his readers, for most of
 them were circulated only amongst his friends) have been gra-
 tified. The letter bore upon the face of it its own want of cre-
 dit, by supposing, that assizes are holden at Belfast, which is no
 county town. It evidently was either the innocent joke of a
 friend, who wished to banter him upon his intimacy with, and
 attachment to the abdicated family, which terminated in his
 procuring the settlement of 4000l. per ann. to the Cardinal of
 York, & one of 2000l. for the widow of that unfortunate Prince
 Chas. Edward: or the malicious hoax of an enemy, who attempt-
 ed to disguise the reality under the wild idea of Jacobitism re-
 viving again in Ireland in favor of the newly acquired title of the

first *jure divino* requisite for Bishops and Priests, you have before said, is *canonical election*. One part of this dogmatical

Cardinal Bishop, the last of that ill-fated family. No fabrication concerning Rome or the Pretender was ever too gross for the ascendancy palate in Ireland. If the worthy Baronet, to whom the communication of the conviction of Levery was made, (that he gave credit to it is evident, from the serious argument he engrafted upon it) really believed, that there was a *Jacobite* party there active in promoting the cause of the Pretender in the north (or any part) of Ireland, confident am I, that he would be as solitary an instance of such credulity, as he has been of Protestant diplomacy to, and direct correspondence with the Bishop of Rome. I said not without reason of him, *it is feared, that advantage has been taken of his easy access, of his avidity for information, &c.* But it is utterly incredible, that any of his acquaintance should play so grossly upon this amiable foible, as to practice upon him with mere fiction of extreme improbability. *Decipimur specie recti.* There probably was at the time alluded to, (I cannot specify where) some proceeding, or prosecution followed by the conviction of one *Levery*, for tendering an Oath to be true to the Duke of York and his Committees; but then, the crime arose out of a much more deep, dark, and dangerous conspiracy, than any, that could then have been set on foot against the succession by *Jacobitical* interest. They were not Committees of a titular Duke of York, Bishop of Frascati, Prince of the House of Stuart, and a Cardinal of the Church of Rome, but of the real Duke of York, Bishop of Osnaburg, a Prince of the House of Brunswick, and Commander in Chief of his Majesty's forces. I hint not, that his Royal Highness was privy to any such Committee. The friend or the foe, who thought it worth his while to furnish the Honourable Baronet with this report of the case of *Levery* for his own purposes, converted the Protestant Bishop Militant into a Po-

dogmatical assertion is *hors de combat*: for Priests never were, nor now are *elected*, either for their ordi-
nation

pish spiritual Prelate, in order either to sport with the feelings of the Protestant champion of Rome, or to mask the reality, and divert the attention of the public from a wicked and extensive conspiracy to a visionary bubble, that had nothing but its subject, extravagance, and insignificance to give it even an ephemeral existence. Had a conviction of that nature taken place under the administration of Lord Cambden, while the triumvirate of *Johns* (Clare, Beresford, and Foster) drove the system of terror and coercion, it would never have been smothered, but would have been industriously worked up into a powerful engine of crimination, confiscation, or extermination. Whereas there were at that time, and for many years subsequently, strong reports afloat, that Orange Committees were sworn in to uphold or stand fast to the interests of the Duke of York, as the real Protestant supporter of the Ascendancy, and to advance him to the throne as the sure means of extinguishing the Catholic's hopes of emancipation: and that Orange Magistrates in certain towns had tendered oaths to this effect to publicans, before they would grant or renew their licences. There is no question, but that the Orangeman's oath (*Vide* Introd. to the 1st Vol. of my last Hist.) qualifies his allegiance to the King and his Successors by the conditional words, *as long as he and they support the Protestant ascendancy*. Since that time there has been a very important renovation of the Orange system (*Vide* third Vol of my last Hist. from p. 750 to 766) and particularly to p. 757, where is mentioned the case of *King at the prosecution of Butler v. Howard*, at the Kilkenny Summer Assizes, 1810, where it came out in evidence from an Orange Yeoman, that he and the whole corps, into which none but sworn Orangemen were admissible, would consider themselves released from their allegiance, and

nation, or institution. And as to Bishops,* you give eighteen instances of foreigners having been appointed to Irish Bishoprics without any election of your clergy, or any recommendation of your nobility or gentry, between the 12th and 16th century; you say many more were so appointed, and you could mention hundreds of inferior Abbot Priors, &c. besides." You give recent instances within your own times of Irish Sees being filled without what you call *canonical election*. You say † you have actually in your possession the original correspondence of the late Dr. Carpenter, Doctor Troy's predecessor in the See of Dublin, who it appears was appointed to that See chiefly through the interest of your Grandfather, and Lord Taaffe, backed by the Court of Lisbon: and that you have also the correspondence of the late Dr. Egan of Tuam, who was first appointed to Achonry, and afterwards to Tuam, through the recommendation

the obligation of their oath, *in case his Majesty favoured the Catholics*. I cannot anticipate the effect which the shifting and dereliction of principle by Lords Liverpool and Castlereagh, and the advice they may consequently give to the executive *to favor the Catholics*, will have upon the Orangemen's oath and allegiance. But this much I am free to say, and I say it before my God, my King, and my Country, that if a shadow of ground subsisted for any such conviction as that of Levery's, it became an imperious duty, as it still is in the Civil Magistrate, to search for the source of the evil, and fathom it, though deep and dark as *Erebus*.

* 2 Col. 130.

† 3 Col. 15.

tion of Mr. Caddel, of Herbertstown, and your grandfather, and your cousin Charles O'Kelly, of the Minerva at Rome. To your own knowledge you say, Doctor Troy was appointed first to Ossory, then to Dublin, through the influence of your cousin O'Kelly, and the recommendation of the Irish Government. Doctor Moylan was appointed to Cork through the recommendation of Lord Kenmare: both of whom you very deservedly commend. If then *canonical election*, which *ex confesso* none of these Prelates had, be, as you say, a *jure divino* requisite for a Bishop, it is therefore a *sine qua non* for subsequent confirmation or collation of spiritual jurisdiction, or Apostolic mission, and you have elsewhere expressed yourself: "No appointment to an Irish Bishopric can be legitimate without the free election of the Diocesan Clergy assembled in Chapter for that purpose after the Bishop's death, *vacante sede*." How then could these illegitimately and invalidly appointed Prelates continue the Hierarchy, impart spiritual jurisdiction to Priests, and validly confer the sacraments? Well do you, Rev. and most learned Doctor, know, that these and many others have been confirmed Bishops in particular Sees, both in and out of Ireland by the Sovereign Pontiff without any previous election, postulation or recommendation; and yet their Apostolic mission or jurisdiction has never been questioned: and I trust, even with all your prepossessions for *National Bishops*, and reluctance to admit

admit the primacy of jurisdiction in the successor of St. Peter, you will not, now your ravening has subsided, assert, that Doctor Troy, and Doctor Moylan are intruders, although not previously elected by the Clergy of their respective Sees. As you know, that they, *Auctoritate Romani Pontificis assumuntur*, you will not push your hardihood so violently against the authority of the Council of Trent, as to assert, *non esse legitimos & veros Episcopos*.

One could not speak seriously of your charge of bequeathing Bishoprics, unless such a portion of malice had been mixed up with the folly of it, to ensnare the ignorant. The fundamental requisite to enable a testator to bequeath is, that he have the property at his own disposal, and that it be in its nature devisable: the bequest is not to depend upon the will or gift of another. A will is revocable and ambulatory during the testator's life, and whatever is taken under the will is the gift or bounty of the testator and of none else. A Bishopric, where there is no civil right or property annexed by law to the person invested with the spiritual jurisdiction, as is the case in Ireland, is not in any sense property. Here the spiritual power or jurisdiction is what constitutes him Bishop of his Diocese: as well might his divine right of Priesthood and consecration be bequeathed; they are both *spiritual objects*, and necessarily therefore out of the competency of the civil power to act upon. In the nomination of a Coadjutor, the will

Bishoprics
not devisable as asserted by Columbanus.

and power of the Pope are only exercised, and if he succeed to the Bishop, to whom he is coadjutor, he receives his spiritual jurisdiction after the death of the Bishop, as much in virtue of the confirmation from the successor of St. Peter, as any other Prelate in the Church of Christ: he takes nothing as representative of, or by donation from his predecessor.

Appoint-
ment of
Coadjutors
discretion-
ary in the
Pope.

The discretionary appointment of Coadjutors by the Pope is a necessary consequence of the *jure divino* primacy of jurisdiction in the successor of St. Peter; consequently even from your own acknowledgment it must be independent of the *civil power*, for though you have before vested in the civil magistrate an actual power of dilating and contracting the divine right of Apostolic mission at his discretion; for *dioceses you say, may in some cases be limited by the State*; you have too malign caution to commit yourself by the explicit propositions, either that the Pope can at all, or can alone grant spiritual jurisdiction or mission throughout every part of Christendom, or that any other person or persons can do it, but by derivation from his Holiness. Your Reverence has repeatedly (and rightly) confined the *spiritual* jurisdiction active and passive of particular Bishops and Parish Priests to their respective dioceses and parishes. I shall not take any shuffling æquivocation, obscure explanation, or ambiguous answers to the above queries. I will also travel in holy company and with a larger retinue than your Reverence: that is, of all legitimate

legitimate and good Bishops appointed or confirmed in their Sees by authority of the Roman Pontiff for eighteen hundred years. You have frequently snarled and barked at the *absolute monarchy principles* of Belarmine, in order to enhance the merit of your own opposition to Papal power: though with your habitual inconsistency you adopt this explicit denial of them by that most Papal of all Papal writers; declaring it to be a mixed Government, viz. a limited monarchy tempered with aristocracy and democracy. I wonder your Reverence's *Anglo-mania* never suggested to you the complimentary analogy, which the English Constitution bears to *Church Government*. You appear to think, that because the spiritual monarchy is successive, that it is therefore absolute or arbitrary. The settled succession of our crown makes not the wearer of it an absolute monarch. Our King governs according to law; but he consents to the enacting of the laws of the realm, which bind him. So the Pope is bounden by the laws or canons of his kingdom: but then they must be such, as reach to every part of the habitable world, for so far extends the kingdom of Christ: and they must affect only such spiritual objects, as are subjected to the powers given by Christ to the governors of his kingdom, which is not of this world. As such spiritual monarch, i. e. as Vicar of Christ upon earth, he cannot surrender, lose or diminish his rights and powers, nor can he in that character acquire any improve-

ment, addition or corroboration of them from the *civil magistrate*. He cannot, as Cranmer and Bonner affected to do, surrender unto the civil magistrate the divine commission: or as the French Constitutional Clergy intended to lodge their spiritual powers or jurisdiction in the hands of the *civil magistrate*, by delivering up their *lettres de pretrize* according to the principles of *Richer*. His character remains as perfect to him, as it existed in St. Peter, when our blessed Lord, told him, "Feed my Lambs, feed my Sheep." But the Pope, in being invested with this *jure divino* primacy of dignity and jurisdiction, remains, as an individual human being liable to all the personal imperfections of mortality, clothed with all the civil rights of social man, and liable to all the political duties either of a temporal and partial Sovereign, or of a subject, precisely, as if he neither were in orders, nor invested with the dignified monarchy of the Kingdom of Christ.

Indispens-
ible duties
of the Pope
in provid-
ing Bishops
for the dis-
persed churches.

There is one paramount duty, which was imposed by Christ upon Peter, and never can be dispensed with in the most remote or trivial manner in any one of his successors: that is, to feed the flock of Christ, by appointing persons to the different Sees, the most fitted to improve their respective folds by instruction, and edify them by example, according to the best of his judgment and discretion. This indispensable obligation he cannot, even in a single instance sacrifice to human respects, wordly profit, or tempo-
ral

ral greatness. He cannot rid himself of it, nor can he, even if he would, put it under the controul, check or interference of any human being. He cannot in person be present, or acquire minute and accurate information of each individual throughout the whole diffusive church. He is therefore compelled by this paramount duty to resort to the means most likely to convey to him the best information, which the circumstances and exigencies of different places, communities and governments are likely to afford, of the abilities and fitness of the individuals, upon whom he ought in the execution of his supreme pastoral function to impart that Apostolic mission or spiritual jurisdiction, which is necessary to carry on the government of the church, and bring his sheep into the heavenly fold. On this sole ground are established concordats with States, patronage or recommendation of great men, popular and capitular elections, clerical postulations, and various other modes, as the most likely means of generally designating the persons best fitted for the sublime charge or care of the souls of particular dioceses. The exercise of any of these preparatives, very improperly called rights, (much less *jure divino* requisites as you say) are not supposed, nor can they in their nature bind or controul the judgment and power of the Sovereign Pontiff: they are intended to help him in forming his discretion; but if he personally know any objection against a person elected, presented or recommended, he cannot

not, as Christ's Vicar, admit the enemy or wolf into the fold; nor can he leave the sheep without the fittest pastor, that human prudence and his Christian and supreme pastoral duty point out to him. Upon these grounds is his Holiness occasionally called upon to appoint a coadjutor * to a full See: either with or without

* Before I close this letter, I shall for the sake of all my readers, submit one *valedictory* observation, that is vitally interesting to the creed, duties, and consolation of all his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects. It will be a stilliard, by which the credit of Columbanus may be poised to a scruple. In his 4th Letter, (p. 29) he thus boasts. "At my ordination, I vowed
 " canonical obedience, and *that* obedience I never have viola-
 " ted, and with the blessing of God, I never will. But am I
 " therefore to submit to the most daring violation of the Ca-
 " nons? To the bequeathing of Dioceses? To the uncano-
 " nical, perhaps the *Simoniacal* appointment of favorites to epis-
 " copal Sees? Why has not Doctor Poynter's zeal been
 " displayed in combating these abuses. Why? because
 " he has been uncanonically appointed himself. Inquire,
 " inquire. Have I not elsewhere shewn, that not even the
 " Pope can nominate his own successor." In a note upon this
 " passage he adds, "Our Bishops and Vicars have exceeded
 " even the abuses of the Court of Rome. There are actually
 " three Archbishops of Dublin: and though the Protestant
 " Archbishop labours under a grievous infirmity, such de-
 " licacy however has been observed in this point, to our shame
 " be it said, that no coadjutor has yet been appointed to him,
 " while Catholic Cork, Catholic Ferns, London District, &c.
 " have violated every principle of the ancient discipline of the
 " church!—and good reader, yet we are not to mention abuses,
 " lest we incur excommunication?" Again he says. (3 Col. 41.)

without *spe successionis*, or *cum futura successione* absolutely; which is nothing more than a reversionary grant

“ Even in those German, African and Italian Churches, which
 “ were founded by the Holy See, and may therefore be con-
 “ sidered as more immediately subject to the jurisdiction of
 “ Rome (a senseless and indecent idea, that the jurisdiction of
 Christ’s Vicar can be partial) “ the Pope could not nominate
 “ successors or coadjutors, as they have been lately nominated
 “ in Ireland.” As Doctor Poynter has now succeeded to the
 episcopal charge of the London District, (Antea 264) it will
 be seen by Columbanus’s conduct towards his spiritual superior,
 whether he be equally restive and refractory in practice, as in
 theory. As my reader will now have nearly waded through
 this unexpectedly protracted letter, I inform him, that for bre-
 vity sake I took for my motto the four concluding words of
 Horace’s portrait of a *niger* (Juveny in his index, says *niger*
pro malus.) I shall now exhibit it at full length. *Whose image*
is this? MAT. XXII. 20.

Absentem, qui rodit amicum ;

Qui non defendit, alio culpante : solutos

Quicapitat risus hominum, famamque dicacis :

Fingere qui non visa potest : commissa tacere

Qui nequit : hic NIGER est : hunc tu Romane Caveto,

He, who malignant tears an absent friend,

Or, when attack’d by others d’ont defend ;

Who trivial bursts of laughter strives to raise,

And courts of prating petulance the praise :

Of things he never saw who tells his tale,

And friendships’ secrets knows not to conceal :

This man is vile : here Roman, fix your mark :

His soul is black, as his complexion’s dark.

FRANCIS’ HOR. 4 Sat.

It will be scarcely credited, that Father Thomassin, the
 learned and orthodox French Oratorian, in his church discipline
 (Part II. Lib. II. XXII. & XXIII.) says, that Coadjutorships to

grant of that mission or jurisdiction, which can be derived from no other source. Innumerable may be the

Bishoprics were usual in the very earliest days of the church. We find in fact, that in the 55th year from the birth of Christ, St. Linus was made Coadjutor to St. Peter: and within the very first century of the Christian Æra Evaristus was made coadjutor to Pope Anacletus. This authority is the stronger against Columbanus, because in the Appendix, N. III. to his first Letter to his countrymen in giving a catalogue of the most learned works on the Catholic Hierarchy, and the rights of the different orders of the Catholic Clergy, he says, *Thomassin de Disciplinâ Eccl.* 3 Vol. fol. Paris, &c. *Fabrics* says of this work, *vastum & eruditum opus*, an immense and learned work. With astonishment will the readers and approvers of Columbanus learn, that the decretals expressly authorize Coadjutorships in cases of sickness and old age. Vide Decretals under the heads of *De Clerico agrotante vel debilitante, apud Greg.* and the canon *Quia frater. Caus.* 7, 9, 1. Every genuine Catholic will be shocked at the flippant arrogance, with which Columbanus represents Coadjutorships as novelties and corruptions in the church, when he finds the Council of Trent assuming their usage in the church, and engrafting upon it a decree, that on the appointment of coadjutors, the Bishops should assign to them a certain portion of the episcopal revenues for their maintenance. Here I beg leave once for all to remark, as I have frequently throughout this letter expressed myself, that whenever decrees of councils, or Papal bulls or briefs direct or enjoin any thing concerning the temporalities or church benefices, they are bottomed entirely upon the presumption of the consent or acquiescence of the *civil magistrate* of the countries, in which such property is respectively situated; without which such directions and injunctions are a complete nullity, having no object to operate upon. Thus in England before the Refor-

the conscientious motives for this exercise of the
 Pope's divine primacy of jurisdiction. The more
 3 B ordinary

mation, a great share of the headship of the *civil establishment* of the Catholic religion was by consent or concession of the nation vested in the Pope; whatever therefore he decreed or enjoined by bull or otherwise, concerning church revenues or ecclesiastical property in England, was valid and took its efficacy from the law of England, whilst it lasted. Hence under a presumption of the continuance, or a hope or expectation of the revival, or a blind, fond or confused understanding of the nature of such national acquiescence, consent or concessions, the same form and *stilus curiæ* are kept up in public instruments, as obtained, whilst the rights expressed to be imparted were actually enjoyed. This may arise from a species of corporate scrupulosity or conscientious punctiliousness, by which persons enjoying only an usufructuary possession, feel themselves called upon to do no act, by which they may be construed to have abandoned, waived or done away any right or benefit, which they are bounden to transmit to their successors, as they received them from their predecessors, and rather improved, than deteriorated, as far as in them lies. Perhaps it might be better, that bulls of confirmation, instruments of institution, and other public or solemn acts collating *spiritual* dignity or jurisdiction contained nothing about temporalities: Where however there is a civil establishment annexed to the objects of the spiritual grant or investiture, it may not be improper to controul, regulate or qualify the use of the temporalities by the spiritual corporations, whether aggregate or sole. Where there is no such civil establishment, the instruments, though still expressed in the same form, are understood to be, as to the temporalities, wholly inoperative by all parties, and are therefore injurious to none. Such is the case upon the face of that instru-

ordinary are, the infirmity of the Bishop, his dereliction or inability, or unwillingness to perform the episcopal functions or duties of his order and office; sometimes to prevent or repair the disturbance and scandal of the flock by canvassing and election. You have instanced something of this necessity in Tuam. I will instance another pressing and compulsory call upon the supreme Pastor's making such a reversionary grant *cum futura successione*; which is, wherever there are well founded reasons for expecting intrigues of turbulent, ambitious and wordly Priests either with the state, people, or clergy, or even *honest exertions*, or *too strong solicitations of influence or interest to procure the mitre*, here the obvious, paramount, and indispensable duty of the universal dispenser of spiritual jurisdiction or Apostolical mission throughout the church militant, is to prevent the mischief and scandal likely to happen to a part of it, by introducing into its government men of worldly habits, dangerous principles, and turbulent dispositions; necessarily therefore will the Pope for the peace, benefit, and edification of his flock, appoint for the immediate successor a person, who has the testimony of a worthy and edifying Prelate, together with that of the other Bishops and respectable Clergymen, a man* "blameless,

ment or bull appointing Doctor Egan to be Coadjutor of Waterford and Lismore, by Pope Ganganeli, in the Appendix, No. X.

* Paul to Titus, 7. As much prejudice is attempted to be raised by the Rev. Doctor Columbanus against the appointment

“ less, as the Steward of God : not self-willed, nor
 “ soon angry, not given to wine, no striker, not gi-
 “ ven to filthy lucre : but a lover of hospitality, a lo-
 “ ver of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate ;
 “ holding fast the faithful word, as he hath been
 “ taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine,
 “ both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.
 “ For there are many unruly and vain talkers and
 “ deceivers, especially they of the circumcision, whose
 “ mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses,
 “ teaching things, which they ought not, for filthy
 “ lucre’s sake.”

Rev. Sir, and most learned Doctor, as you have so
 openly and so nobly professed in the face of your
 country and the world at large,† That, *I detest false-
 hood; and if I advance one word of untruth, I shall most
 gladly make amends by a public recantation,*” it is
 hoped you will make good your promise by

Your humble Servant,

And well-wisher,

FRANCIS PLOWDEN, L. C. D.

of Coadjutors, the reader will find in the Appendix, No. X.
 the form of such appointment, which will give him very diffe-
 rent ideas upon the subject from those, which he may have re-
 ceived from the Lecture of Columbanus.

* 2 Col. 216.



less, as the steward of God: not self-willed, nor
 soon angry, not given to wine, no surker, not gi-
 ven to filthy lucre: but a lover of hospitality, a lo-
 ver of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate;
 holding fast the faithful word, as he hath been
 taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine,
 both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers.
 For there are many unlearned and vain talkers and
 deceivers, especially they of the circumcision, whose
 mouths must be stopped, who rob Peter whole houses
 of teaching things, which they ought not, for filthy
 lucre's sake."

Rev. Sir, and most learned Doctor, as you have so
 openly and so nobly professed in the face of your
 country and the world at large, That I esteem false-
 hood, and if I advance one word of untruth, I shall most
 gladly make amends by a public retraction. It is
 hoped you will make good your promise by

Your humble servant,

And well-wisher,

FRANCIS FLOWDEN, L. C. D.

of Cambridge, the reader will find in the Appendix, No. X.
 the form of such appointment, which will give him very dis-
 tinct ideas upon the subject from those, which he may have re-
 ceived from the lectures of Cyprianus.



APPENDIX.

No. I.

Lands granted to the Duke of Ormonde by the Act of Settlement and Court of Claims. *Carte's Orm. 2 vol. p. 132.*

COUNTIES.	LANDS.	OLD PROPRIETORS.
Gallway	Moate, &c.....	Mr. Kelly
Kildare	{ Rathcoffy, &c.	Mr. Nicholas Wogan
	{ Kilrush, &c.....	Morris Fitzgerald
Meath	Dunboyne, &c.....	Lord Dunboyne
Dublin	{ Balcony, &c.....	George Blackney
	{ Kinure, &c.....	Patrick Walsh
Waterford	Carrigbegg, &c.....	James Butler
	{ Milhill, &c.	Ulicke Wall
Catherlogh	{ Kilcorle, &c.....	Edm. Birne
	{ Balliceally, &c.....	Gerald Nolan
	{ Balligowen, alias Smith's- town* and New-Church, }	Walter Walsh
Kilkenny	{ Rathana, &c.....	Mr. Archer
	{ Rathardmoore.....	Pierce Shortall
	{ Tubrid, &c.....	Robert Shortall
	{ Ballynoran.....	Pierce Butler
	{ Myler's-town.....	John White
Tipperary	{ Hussey's-town.....	Edward Butler
	{ Fleming's-town.....	Edmond Prendergast
	{ Moore-town, &c.....	David Walsh

A

COUNTIES.

* Smith's-town contained 834 acres, and New-Church 116 acres, two rood and eight pole, and was granted by the Duke to Robert Walsh and his heirs male, for the rent of £5. a year.

COUNTIES. LANDS. OLD PROPRIETORS.

	Borrinduffe, &c.	Nicholas Whyte
	Rathloose, &c.	Thomas Whyte
	Knocklosty, &c.	Theo. Butler
	Bathcastin.	Tho. Butler
	James-town.	Solomon Whyte
	Orchards-town.	Edmond Bray
	Loghloherly.	Morris Keating
	Deregrath, &c.	Richard Keating
	Boytonrath.	Edmond Butler
	Castle-Moyle, &c.	Walter Butler
	Shanbally Duffe.	Pierce Butler
	Ballinree.	Walter Butler
	Rathconne.	Sir Richard Everard
	Brechindowne, &c.	{ Thomas Butler James Butler
	Miler's-town.	Walter Hackett
	Bollihomucke.	Richard Birmingham
Tipperary <	Tyllocaslane.	Piers Butler
	Ballinadlea.	William Butler
	Balliowen, &c.	Simon Salt
	Bulliknocke.	Redmond Magrath
	Cloran.	Robert Shee
	Miltown.	Lord Dunboyne
	Tullaghmaine, &c.	Richard Comin
	Coolenagon.	Edmond Hogan
	Toburbryen.	Dan. Ryan
	Lislin Franca.	W. Burks
	Moinarde.	Edm. Heyden
	Archer's-town.	James Archer
	Cloghmartin.	James Butler
	Tullomain James.	Lord Skerryin
	Moynetemple.	Edmond Heyden
	Boresoleigh.	Richard Bourke
	Ballinneny.	{ W. Kennedy Philip Glissan.

No. II.

The Oath which was framed by King James I. and proposed by him to be taken by all his Catholic subjects.

“ I, A. B. do truly and sincerely acknowledge, profess, testify and declare, in my conscience before God and the world, that our Sovereign Lord King James is lawful and rightful King of this Realm, and of all other his Majesty’s dominions and countries: and that the Pope, neither of himself, nor by any authority of the Church or See of Rome, or by any other means with any other, hath any power or authority to depose the King, or to dispose of any of his Majesty’s kingdoms or dominions, or to authorize any foreign Prince to invade or annoy him or his countries, or to discharge any of his subjects of their allegiance and obedience to his Majesty: or to give licence or leave to any of them to bear arms, raise tumults, or to offer any violence or hurt to his Majesty’s Royal person, state or government, or to any of his Majesty’s subjects, within his Majesty’s dominions. Also, I do swear from my heart, that notwithstanding any declaration or sentence of excommunication or deprivation made or granted, or to be made or granted by the Pope or his Successors, or by any authority derived or pretended to be derived from him or his See, against the King, his Heirs or Successors, or any absolution of the said subjects from their obedience: I will bear faith and true allegiance to his Majesty, his Heirs and Successors, and him and them will defend to the utmost of my power against all conspiracies and attempts whatsoever which shall be made against his or their persons, their crown and dignity, by reason or colour of any such sentence or declaration or otherwise, and will do my best endeavours to disclose and make known unto his Majesty, his Heirs and Successors, all treasons and traitorous conspiracies which I shall know or hear of to be against him or any of them. And I do further swear, that I do from my heart abhor, detest and abjure, as impious and heretical, this damnable doctrine and position

“ that princes, which be excommunicated or deprived by the
 “ Pope, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or any
 “ other whatsoever. And I do believe, and in my conscience
 “ I am resolved, that neither the Pope, nor any other person
 “ whatsoever, hath power to absolve me of this oath or any
 “ part thereof, which I acknowledge by good and full authority
 “ to be lawfully ministered unto me, and do renounce all par-
 “ dons and dispensations to the contrary. And all these things
 “ I do plainly and sincerely acknowledge and swear, according
 “ to these express words by me spoken, and according to the
 “ plain and common sense and understanding of the same words,
 “ without any equivocation, or mental evasion, or secret reser-
 “ vation whatsoever: and I do make this recognition and
 “ acknowledgment heartily, willingly and truly, upon the true
 “ faith of a christian. SO HELP ME GOD.”

The Oath prescribed to be taken by his Majesty's Roman Ca-
 tholic subjects, who wish to avail themselves of the benefit of
 the 39th of his present Majesty. (*British Statute.*)

“ I, A. B. sincerely promise and swear, that I will be faith-
 “ ful and bear true allegiance to his Majesty King George III.
 “ and him will defend, to the utmost of my power, against all
 “ conspiracies and attempts whatsoever that shall be made
 “ against his person, crown or dignity: and I will do my ut-
 “ most endeavour to disclose and make known to his Majesty,
 “ his heirs and successors, all treasons and traitorous conspira-
 “ cies, which may be formed against him or them: and I do
 “ faithfully promise to maintain, support and defend to the ut-
 “ most of my power the succession of the crown, which suc-
 “ cession, by an act intituled, *An Act for the further limitation*
 “ *of the Crown, and better securing the rights and liberties*
 “ *of the subject*, is and stands limited to the Princess Sophia,
 “ Electress and Dutchess Dowager of Hanover, and the heirs
 “ of her body, *being Protestants*; hereby utterly renouncing
 “ and abjuring any obedience or allegiance unto any other per-

“son claiming or pretending a right to the crown of these
 “realms: and I do swear, that I do reject and detest as an un-
 “christian and impious position, that it is lawful to murder or
 “destroy any person or persons whatsoever, for or under the
 “pretence of their being heretics or infidels: and also, that un-
 “christian and impious principle, that faith is not to be kept
 “with heretics or infidels. And I further declare, that it is
 “not an article of my faith, and that I do renounce, reject
 “and abjure the opinion, that Princes excommunicated by the
 “Pope and Council, or any authority of the See of Rome, or
 “by any authority whatsoever, may be deposed or murdered by
 “their subjects or any person whatsoever: And I do promise,
 “that I will not hold, maintain or abet any such opinion, or
 “any other opinion contrary to what is expressed in this decla-
 “ration: and I do declare, that I do not believe, that the Pope of
 “Rome, or any other foreign Prince, Prelate, State or Potentate,
 “hath, or ought to have, any temporal or civil jurisdiction, pow-
 “er, superiority or pre-eminence, directly or indirectly, within
 “this realm: And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, pro-
 “fess, testify and declare, that I do make this declaration and
 “every part thereof in the plain and ordinary sense of the words
 “of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental re-
 “servation whatever, and without thinking, that I am or can be
 “acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration,
 “or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other persons
 “or authority whatsoever, shall dispense with or annul the same,
 “or declare, that it was null and void. So HELP ME GOD.”

The Oath and Declaration required to be taken by his Majesty's
 subjects professing the Roman Catholic religion, in order to
 entitle them to the benefits of the 33d of his present Majesty.
 (*Irish Statute.*)

“I, A. B. do hereby declare, that I do profess the Roman
 “Catholic religion. I, A. B. do swear, that I do abjure, con-
 “demn and detest, as unchristian and impious, the principle,
 “that it is lawful to murder, destroy, or any ways injure any per-
 “son

“son whatsoever for or under the pretence of being a here-
 “tic. And I do declare solemnly before God, that I believe
 “that no act in itself unjust, immoral or wicked, can ever be
 “justified or excused by or under pretence or colour, that it
 “was done either for the good of the Church, or in obedience
 “to any Ecclesiastical power whatsoever. I also declare, that
 “it is not an article of the Catholic faith, neither am I thereby
 “required to believe, or profess, that the Pope is infallible, or
 “that I am bound to obey any order in its own nature immoral,
 “though the Pope or any Ecclesiastical power should issue or
 “direct such order: but on the contrary, I hold, that it would
 “be sinful in me to pay any respect or obedience thereto. I
 “further declare, that I do not believe, that any sin whatsoever
 “committed by me can be forgiven at the mere will of any
 “Pope, or of any Priest, or of any person or persons what-
 “soever; but that sincere sorrow for past sins, a firm and sin-
 “cere resolution to avoid future guilt, and to atone to God,
 “are previous and indispensable requisites to establish a well-
 “founded expectation of forgiveness: and that any person, who
 “receives absolution without these previous requisites, so far
 “from obtaining thereby any remission of his sins, incurs the
 “additional guilt of violating a sacrament. And I do swear,
 “that I will defend to the utmost of my power the settlement
 “and arrangement of property in this country, as established
 “by the laws now in being. I do hereby disclaim, disavow
 “and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present
 “Church establishment, for the purpose of substituting a Ca-
 “tholic establishment in its stead. And I do solemnly swear,
 “that I will not exercise any privilege, to which I am or may
 “become entitled, to disturb or weaken the Protestant religion
 “and Protestant government of this kingdom.

“SO HELP ME GOD.”

N.B. It is observable, that the only difference between these oaths, as to the
 abjuring part, consists in the epithets applied to the abjured doctrines,
 which in James's act are termed *impious* and *heretical*, and in the two
 latter with more propriety, *unchristian* and *impious*. For there never was
 a *heresy* of such tendency.

No. III.

Proofs of the truth of the following passage in the note p. 818, of the history of Ireland since the Union. “An ordinary reader may wonder, why the author’s treatment of the Duke of Ormonde should excite such an ebullition in the breast of the Rev. *Veto* Doctor. Presumption suggests Dr. O’Conor’s consciousness of the strict analogy of his own situation under an Ex-Governor of Ireland, *not uninvigorated and uncheered by the warm beams of munificent patronage*, (so he boasts in his prologomenon to a promised translation of the old Irish annals into Latin) to that of the recreant Peter Walsh, who found patronage, favor and support from Ormonde, having, through his Grace, been appointed Seneschal to the Bishop of Winchester. He quitted the Evangelical labours of his vocation in Ireland for other pursuits in England: he employed his literary attainments in defending unsound opinions and refractory conduct to his spiritual superiors: he receded so far from Catholic doctrine and discipline, as to have been generally supposed a Protestant, though he never read his recantation: he was not only suspended from his faculties, but disciplined by his Bishop. Archbishop Talbot exposed and censured his opinions and conduct in a book intituled *The Friar disciplined*.”

The Rev. Father PETER WALSH, The Rev. CHA. O’CONOR, D.D.
of the Order of St. Francis, Professor of Divinity.

Was a native of Ireland, in Priest’s orders, a Friar of the order of St. Francis, owing by virtue of his religious vow, special obedience to the superior of his order.	Is a native of Ireland, a secular clergyman in Priest’s orders, a sworn <i>Alumnus</i> of the Irish Ludovisian College at Rome, owing by virtue of the oath* taken by every <i>Alumnus</i> of that College special obedience to the ordinary of his native diocese.
--	--

Was

* The formula of the religious vows of poverty, chastity and obedience, is generally known: but there are parts of the oath of a Ludovisian

WALSH.

O'CONOR.

Was a professor of and Is a Doctor of Divinity, tho'
taught theology, though never he never professed or taught
made

Alumnus, which, to a certain extent, affect the subject matter of this letter, and are known to few. The formula is given at the end of the *Constitutiones Collegii Ludovisiani Hibernorum. Romæ 1773*. The following is a faithful translation of it into English. "I, N. the son of N. of the
"diocese of N. having full knowledge of the institute of this College, do
"voluntarily subject myself to its laws and constitutions, which I accept
"according to the explanation of my superiors, and I promise to observe
"them to the utmost of my power. Moreover I promise and swear, that
"whilst I shall remain in this College, and after I shall have quitted it in
"any manner, either having finished or not having finished my studies, I
"will not enter into any religious society or regular congregation without
"the special licence of the holy See, or of the sacred congregation for the
"propagation of the Faith, nor shall I make my profession in any one of
"them. I also promise and swear, that with the good will of the sacred
"congregation for the propagation of the Faith, or of the most eminent
"protector for the time being of this College, and of the kingdom of Ire-
"land, I will embrace the Ecclesiastical state, and I will be advanced to
"all the holy orders, even of Priesthood, when to my superiors it shall
"seem good. I also vow and swear, that whether I shall have entered into
"religion, or shall remain in the secular state, if I shall be within the con-
"fines of Europe I will yearly, if without them every second year, make
"a report to the sacred congregation for the propagation of the Faith, of
"myself, my state, employment and situation, where I shall be stationary.
"I vow moreover and swear, that I will by the order of the aforesaid con-
"gregation for the propagation of the Faith, or of the most eminent pro-
"tector for the time being, return into my country without delay, and that
"I will there unceasingly employ myself in administering the Sacraments,
"and use my utmost exertions for the salvation of souls: which I will also
"do, if with the licence of the aforesaid See I shall have entered into any
"religious order, society or regular congregation, and shall have made my
"profession in any one of them. Lastly, I vow and swear, that I under-
"stand the aforesaid oath and it's obligation, and that I will observe it ac-
"cording to the declarations made concerning it by the sacred congregation
"for the propagation of the Faith, and corroborated by the apostolical
"breve, bearing date the 20th day of July, 1660.

"SO HELP ME GOD, AND THESE HIS HOLY GOSPELS."

WALSH.

O'CONNOR.

made a Doctor of Divinity:

(Præf. to Hist. Rem. XL.)

"If the truth were known it
 "would be found, that Beronius, and the rest following
 "him, were willing to make
 "use of any malicious ungrounded fictions whatsoever
 "against Justinian: not that
 "they believed him to have
 "either lived at any time, or
 "died at last in any wilful or
 "imputable error: or in any
 "at all, otherwise, than as St.
 "Cyprian of Carthage did:

theology*.

(5 Col. 30. 1, 2.) "No peo-

"people on earth, says the V.
 "Bishop of Castabala can
 "make laws of *any kind* for
 "the spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ." (Let. p. 90.)

What civil magistrate's power reaches, as the kingdom of Christ's does, to every part of the habitable globe?) "What then were the Ecclesiastical laws of the Saxon Kings, Ina, Whithred, Edgar, Alfred, Canute, which have

* It is usual for each Ludovisian Alumnus (they receive a gratuitous education from papal bounty, as Dr. O'Connor (5 Col. 13) upbraids the Bishop of Castabala with having received a charity school education,) who has been found worthy of finishing his course of studies and of being promoted to holy orders, to receive the degree of Doctor of Divinity, from the Prefect of the *Propaganda*, who is authorized to grant it by a papal decree of Urban VIII. in 1627, and confirmed and extended by a rescript of Clement XIV. in 1772. This is done before they return to their native diocese, in order to give them more consequence and respectability amongst their countrymen. The motives for conferring such degree are thus specifically detailed on the face of the instrument of collation. "Not indeed for his attaining the celebrity of human and perishable praise, but for stirring up in him the emulation of virtue and learning, which, as they encrease with age in prudent and well-ordered youths, will, by their own attractions excite them to true glory, and cheerfully to undertake the function of spreading the Catholic faith throughout the whole world; in which, barring all human considerations, but looking aloft, they have in their wishes, desires and contemplations eternal glory in heaven, which is the reward prepared for them for their teaching, labours and well-spent life." Columbanus will compare this version with his original *diploma*, unless he shall have committed it with his progenitor's memoirs and effigy to the post, or mean to drop his graduated dignity with the academic honors of Cortona.

WALSH.

O'CONOR.

“ but that his laws in Ecclesi-
 “ astical matters, *even those of*
 “ *faith*, are a perpetual eye-
 “ sore to them: because these
 “ laws are a precedent to all
 “ other good princes to govern
 “ their own respective churches
 “ in like manner, without any
 “ regard of *Bulla Cænæ* or so
 “ many other vain allegations of
 “ those men, who would make
 “ the world believe it unlawful
 “ for secular Princes to make
 “ Ecclesiastical laws by their
 “ own sole authority, for the
 “ government of the Church.”

Arch-Bishop Talbot said of
 him in 1674, (Fr. Dis. 10.)—
 “ His ambition of a mitre was
 “ so excessive thirty years ago,
 “ that to obtain it, he turned
 “ the greatest rebel and *nunci-*
 “ *onist* of the Irish nation: and
 “ had a greater hand in the
 “ rejection of the peace of 46
 “ (and by consequence in the
 “ destruction of the late King
 “ and his people) than any man
 “ living, or all the clergy, that
 “ he accuseth of it. The re-
 “ pulse he then met with after
 “ his eminent services to the
 “ *nuntio*, of treasons against the
 “ King, deprived him of that
 “ little wit he had: and ever

“ been published by Spelman,
 “ Whitlock, Lambert, Wil-
 “ kins, Johnson, Beveridge,
 “ Linwood? What were the *ca-*
 “ *pitularia Francorum?* which
 “ have been so eruditely pub-
 “ lished by the learned Baluz?
 “ In all Catholic countries, the
 “ abuse of spiritual power was
 “ by the civil laws subjected
 “ without appeal, and in *der-*
 “ *nier* resort to the civil ma-
 “ gistrate.”

His ambition for the See of
 Elphin was so great, that when
 the health of the late Bishop
 French was on the visible de-
 cline, it appears from his own
 avowals, that he was himself in
 correspondence about it with
 Dr. Troy and Dr. Moylan, that
 application was made on his be-
 half for the influence of the
 Marquis of Buckingham, and
 that he had secured offers
 from Cardinal Maury at Rome,
 and Abbé Walsh at Paris for
 the interest of the court of St.
 Cloud for him at Rome. The
 failures he had met with con-
 vinced him, that the canvas after
 Dr. French's death, would be

WALSH.

“ since he has been printing
 “ of libels, and troubling the
 “ world with an odd kind of
 “ raw indigested heresies, sto-
 “ len from the worst of authors,
 “ but so unconnected and ab-
 “ surdly applied by his dull
 “ pen, that though you may
 “ see he hath read some books,
 “ yet you will easily perceive
 “ he understood very few : and
 “ such as he understood he
 “ wrested to a wrong sense.—
 “ No mervail therefore, if his
 “ notions be false, his dis-
 “ courses confused, his argu-
 “ ments weake, and his contra-
 “ dictions so frequent, that to
 “ confute him, you need go no
 “ further, than his own wri-
 “ tings.”

(Ib. 11.) “ He is so trans-
 “ ported with passion against
 “ the Church of Rome, and those
 “ two great pillars thereof, *Bel-*
 “ *larmino* and *Baronius*, that
 “ he treats and terms them no
 “ better than men hired by the
 “ Roman court to sacrifice all
 “ the world to the Pope’s ambi-
 “ tion. The rage he is in for not
 “ finding out arguments to make
 “ this and his other calumnies
 “ credible, is so extraordinary,

O’CONOR.

equally unsuccessful amongst
 the Irish clergy, to whom he
was known, as they had been
 during his life. He then affected
 qualms, scruples and conscien-
 tious objections to the said can-
 vas, when the See was vacant,
 which no one had heard of du-
 ring the year’s canvas, whilst
 the See was full. Since that
 time he has published his five
 letters or addresses to his coun-
 trymen, answering in every the
 most minute particular, the de-
 scription given of the Friar’s
 productions by the Arch-bishop.
 Similar causes produce similar
 effects.

He devotes a large portion of
 his No. II. or historical address
 to his countrymen to the prov-
 ing, (p. 71) that the Pope’s
 nuncio and the Bishops, who
 were sworn adherents to the
Regalia of Rome, and main-
 tainers of the ultramontain
 principles of that Court, did,
 after the excommunication of
 Queen Elizabeth, frequently
 give countenance to those *tem-*
poral notions, so as to embody

WALSH.

“ that he forgets what he said
 “ in the foregoing page or line,
 “ and through his whole work
 “ never remembers to speak
 “ consequently in any one par-
 “ ticular.”

In his epistle dedicatory to the Duke of Ormonde he said, it was about 23 years since he had presumed to appear in print under the patronage of his Grace, and gratitude obliged him to make that address to him, on that, which would probably be his last work, in return for the goodness, with which he had always treated him. He thanked him for the value he had been pleased to put on his honest endeavours to serve his Grace, who had spent a great part of his life so eminently in governing the kingdom of Ireland. The ambition of appear-

O'CONOR.

a powerful Irish faction against the loyal principles of the Irish nobility and gentry from that period down to our own times.

Some years after he had, through the influence, or by stipulation or command of his new patron, drowned, suffocated or immured his Grandfather's memoirs, sentiments and effigy, he boasts in 1803, thro' his bookseller* Dodsley (Ann. Reg. for 1803, p. 936,) that “ however delightful and
 “ satisfactory the pursuit of
 “ recondite knowledge is to
 “ the secluded scholar, sterile
 “ and useless to the world
 “ would prove the labours of
 “ the most erudite, when unin-
 “ vigorated and uncheered by
 “ the warm beams of munifi-

* It is passing strange, that Dr. Charles O'Connor, even after he had raised the Vizor, dropt the borrowed dignity of Columbanus, and openly addressed the Most Noble the Marquis of Buckingham, whose very name in 1810 he durst not mention, should be inattentive to the respective relations of Dr. Milner to Coyne, and Dr. O'Connor to Dodsley. Yet (5 Col. 110) he thus taunts his opponent Dr. Milner: “ You, who allow your editor, *that is yourself*, to bespatter you with the most fulsome adulation in your advertisement prefixed to your own *dab*.” The difference is; one *dab* was in the year 1803, *in actu fieri*: and in 1812 is *nondum factum*. The other *dab* had for some time been before the English public, and a Dublin bookseller thinking it adviseable to throw it into circulation amongst his own countrymen, prefixed to it such an advertisement, as he conceived would best forward the sale.

WALSH.

ing under the protection of a great name gave him the boldness of using his Grace's with the most profound respect, and grateful acknowledgments of a soul deeply sensible of his great and long-continued kindness.

O'CONOR.

cent patronage: happily in the present instance they have *not* been with-held, but have been employed with a generous profusion in calling forth the abilities of Dr. O'Conor into light and activity; thereby conferring on Ireland in particular, and the antiquarian and scholar of every clime the most weighty obligation." In dedicating his *fifth* and *last* work to the great *Ex-Governor*, thereby importing his approbation of the four preceding, he anticipates it's recommendation to every description of persons in his native country, from the confidence, which they naturally repose in a name so justly respected by them as his Lordship's.

Be it here remarked once for all, that Peter Walsh was right in the *causa Valesiana*, as he calls it: that is, there is nothing contained in the remonstrance, which he framed, signed and supported, loosely as it is worded, which cannot be, with a safe conscience, sworn by a Roman Catholic: it differs not substantially from the oaths actually sworn by the English and Irish Catholics, contained in the Appendix No. II.; and therefore that he was, on that score, unjustly excommunicated. But that warranted not his aberrations from truth, his circulation of unsound and schismatical doctrines, nor his fractious and improper conduct to his superiors. In these consists the parallel of the two *protégés* of the two great *unparagoned* and *unsophisticated*

Ex-Governors. Would to God I could lay my finger upon a single pivot of truth fairly, clearly and consistently put, and persevered in, throughout the five addresses of Columbanus to his countrymen. Wishing to deal openly and candidly with my readers, I give a genuine copy of that remonstrant oath in the Appendix No. IX. that the present and future generations may clearly see, and therefore prudently avoid all such occasions, pretexts, or causes of national dissention, calamity and misfortune.

It is also proper here to submit to the public, what Arch-bishop Talbot mentions in a public letter he wrote in answer to Walsh's charges and calumnies against him: (F.D. 78) "As for my answer to his petition against me presented to the council in England, I could not excuse answering it, having been commanded by the Lord Lieutenant and Council of Ireland, where I was to put in my answer, which contained nothing but truth: and so it appeared to that honourable board, which declared me innocent. It was no other, but that I never persecuted him nor any of his seven Friars Remonstrants, in whose behalf he petitioned. Neither did I, nor could I excommunicate any Regulars, who (by the Roman canons) are exempted from the Ordinary's jurisdiction. Neither indeed did their own regular superiors punish them for signing the remonstrance, but for cheating the people of money, and for exacting it from the King's subjects, by virtue of a counterfeit commission from the Pope."

WALSH

Says of his countrymen in 1674, (Pref. VII.) "The very notion of the Catholic or universal Church (the undoubted spouse of Christ) was in a manner lost amongst them; at least so obscured by them, that many of the faithful, especially the mid-

O'CONOR

Says of his countrymen in 1810, (2 Col. 96) "The Irish ideas require to be chastened by those of the gospel." (2 Col. 198.) "The rude ignorance of the mass of our people placed them beyond the reach of that knowledge of genuine Catholicity, which

WALSH.

“dle sort of them, scarce know
 “ what to hold, or where to
 “ find it.”

(Address to the Catholics of
 England, Ireland, and Scotland,
 xix. & xx.) “ These also have
 “ already at their consecration
 “ bound themselves Liegemen
 “ to his Holiness, even by the
 “ very strictest oath, that could
 “ be sworn or penned. Who-
 “ soever shall consider all and
 “ every the special ties of this
 “ oath, will not much admire
 “ at the carriage either of the
 “ Irish arch-bishops, bishops,
 “ and other ecclesiastics at Wa-
 “ terford in Ireland, under the
 “ precedency of the papal nun-
 “ cio *Rinuccini*, in the year
 “ 1646 (N.B. Peter Walsh was
 a staunch and violent oppo-
 nent of this peace) against the
 “ peace of the same year, or
 “ of the other of the prelates
 “ of the said kingdom after at
 “ James-town against the peace
 “ of 1648. We know they
 “ must be perjured to the Pope,
 “ if they prove faithful to the
 “ King. Whether so or no to
 “ God, judge you. I am sure,
 “ if they were not traytors in
 “ taking the aforesaid oath to
 “ his Holiness, they were at

O'CONOR.

“ distinguishes the gentry of
 “ Ireland beyond those of every
 “ other Catholic country.”

(2 Col. 123.) “ Those Bi-
 “ shops, who in 1646 unfurled
 “ the papal standard, those,
 “ who imprisoned our nobi-
 “ lity, those, who declared
 “ the Pope's nuncio *generalis-*
 “ *simo* of our armies, those,
 “ who deposed our most gallant
 “ generals, and by their ex-
 “ communications disarmed of-
 “ ficers, whom no other power
 “ could awe, and no other force
 “ could conquer, all alledged,
 “ that they acted under *spiritu-*
 “ *al* jurisdiction, and they could
 “ hardly reconcile any other
 “ conduct with their oath of
 “ consecration. This word *spi-*
 “ *ritual* is therefore, in our
 “ Irish acceptation, a sort of
 “ vague legerdemain word of
 “ dubious meaning, which re-
 “ quires to be defined. To
 “ what are we to attribute
 “ those strange, foolish, anti-
 “ catholic canting notions of
 “ *spiritual* power, prevailing
 “ in the minds of such a gal-
 “ lant and quick-sighted a na-
 “ tion as the Irish?” at the
 “ very door of England and in
 “ the blaze of light, which has

WALSH.

“least renouncers of their al-
 “legiance to his Majesty, and
 “their obedience also to the
 “Catholic church.”

As every Roman Catholic (even Dr. C. O’Conor, 5 Col. 12.) holds general councils infallible in proposing articles of faith, Walsh assiduously assumed, that the Gallican declaration, which asserted a right to examine and discuss before acceptance or submission to new decrees concerning canons or morals, (an unerring decree of faith is not revisable by those, who admit it’s inerrancy, *ut patet*) unwarrantably infers the superiority of an Œcumenical Council over the Pope (against the direct opposition of De Marca Con. Sac. L. 3 c. 7. and many others) and asserts, that that declaration was made *against* the Pope. (Address to the Catholics of England, Ireland and Scotland, xiii.)

(Pref. to Rem. xvi.) “Their
 “missionaries, that is, their
 “Priests, not only day and night
 “labour to make new pro-
 “selytes, but also to infuse
 “into as many of them, and
 “of their other penitents as

O’CONOR.

been thrown upon the subject by Bossuet, De Marca, Fleury, and hundreds of other most Catholic divines?

As every Roman Catholic holds, that the Gallican Church remained in communion with the See of Rome after and notwithstanding the declaration of 1682 concerning ecclesiastical power, with a view to varnish and justify his antipathy and outrages to the holy See, he insidiously assumes the Gallican propositions to have been made *against* the Pope, wickedly attempts to raise the Irish Laity against their clergy for refusing those liberties to his countrymen, and atrociously misrepresents that declaration by omitting every word in it respectful and submissive to the holy See: as will appear by comparison of the original with his garbled and mutilated copy of it in the Appendix. No. V.

(2 Col. 119, 122) “I should
 “be glad to know, whether he
 “who swears, that he rejects
 “all foreign temporal power,
 “both direct and indirect on
 “the part of the Pope, and yet
 “not only allows his interfe-

WALSH.

“ they think fit, all their own
 “ principles of equivocation,
 “ and mental reservation in
 “ swearing any oath, even of
 “ allegiance or supremacy to
 “ the King, and forswearing
 “ any thing or doctrine what-
 “ soever, except only those ar-
 “ ticles, which by the indis-
 “ pensible condition of their
 “ communion they may not
 “ dissemble upon oath. That
 “ the tenet of transubstantia-
 “ tion is one of these articles.
 “ Therefore to discover by this
 “ (however otherwise in itself
 “ a very harmless criterium)
 “ the mischief, which they con-
 “ ceive to go along with it,
 “ through the folly of Roman
 “ Catholics in these dominions,
 “ they make it the test of dis-
 “ criminating the *loyally prin-*
 “ *cipled* Protestants, from the
 “ *disloyal and dissembling Pa-*
 “ *pists.*”

Closes a very long muster
 roll of stupid, wicked and

O'CONOR.

“ rence in the patronage of e-
 “ very diocese in Ireland, but
 “ also applies to him for no-
 “ mination to every Bishop-
 “ wick worth from £200 to
 “ £700 per annum is not
 “ guilty of a violation of that
 “ oath?” We are episcopally
 informed by the Bishop of Cas-
 tabala, and then *synodically*
 by the Bishops assembled at
 Tullow, and again by those as-
 sembled in Dublin, “ that the
 “ oath of allegiance abundant-
 “ ly provides for the security
 “ of the state by excluding all
 “ foreign, except that spiritual
 “ power, which is now exercised
 “ in Ireland.” This is not only
 nugatory and disingenuous, be-
 cause it is resting on a word,
 which is *undefined*, and there-
 fore liable to equivocation: but
 it is worse than nugatory, be-
 cause it is trifling with the so-
 lemnity of an oath, and ex-
 posing enlightened Catholics,
 who entertain strong doubts on
 the extent of *spiritual* jurisdic-
 tion, to the torments of con-
 scientious scruples and to the
 fear of evident prevarication.”

In charging the Bishop of
 Castabala with arrogant and

WALSH.

damnable errors and positions, which he charges to be taught and practised by the greater part of the Catholic church, by observing, that they are (Pref. IX.) “against the plain “design of the whole Gospel “itself, to drive directly by “such *positions* at the proper “scope of the Alcoran, and “establish in the Church of “Christ a worser tyranny, “than that of the *Mahumedans* “and *Mamelukes*.”

Was taunted by his opponents with non-observance of his religious obligations (Fr. Dis. 70.) “Mr. Walsh, I would “not have his Grace advise to “put you to death, but would “have you not trouble him: “avoid the occasion, and re-

O'CONOR.

heretical doctrines, he tells him (3 Col. 31) he “would gladly “beget a snivelling race of “sycophant priests, who, de- “graded by the Mahomedan “principles of the Turkish “diocese of Castabala, would “wink at abuses, &c.” (Ib. 29) “If the Bishop of Castabala “is to judge *exclusively* ac- “cording to his Turkish no- “tions, he is a synod in him- “self.” (2 Col. 37) “I would “hold myself to have degenera- “ted indeed, if I could submit “to the Mahomedan principles “of Castabala.” (3 Col. 138) “Assimilating the government “of the Catholic Church of “Ireland to that of a Turkish “Basha at Castabala.”

Is charged by some of his antagonists with living in habitual non-observance of his Ludovician Oath. England not being his country, they urge against him, that the care of the Stowe library*, is not the evangelical function of admi-

* I observe in the contents of the 2d No. of Columbanus, to the following head, *Expensive Law Suits carried on by foreign influence agents at Rome down to our own times.*—120. the following *Quere* put to my highly valued and esteemed friend, Dr. Bodkin: “Can the present “Warden of Galway state in *verbo sacerdotis*, what that Suit cost, which “the town of Galway employed him to carry on at Rome, against the “pretensions of the late Arch-Bishop Egan?” *Cum boná veniá Doctoris Doctissimi*, I will put a similar *Quere*, and perhaps of no less conse-

WALSH.

“tire into your convent. But
 “I fear you had rather venture
 “hanging, than do that. If
 “you be not guilty, in God’s
 “name make out your inno-
 “cency.”

(Pref. L.) “For what con-
 “cerns either myself, or my
 “said fellow *remonstrants*, I
 “have also before now at large,
 “and of purpose in my afore-
 “said *Latina Hybernica*, Part
 “III. c. 5. 6. 7. discovered (as
 “I shall yet hereafter in the
 “2d tome of this English work
 “as in a more proper place dis-
 “cover) the imposture of those
 “for one part lying, and for the
 “rest deceitful vain objections.”
 N.B. Neither the Latin *Hyber-*
nica, nor the 2d tome of the
 English work ever made their
 appearance before the public.

O’CONOR.

nistering the sacraments, nor
 do they consider his addresses
 to his countrymen, as the ut-
 most exertions for the salvation
 of souls. If the charges be
 unfounded, he has the means
 of refuting them.

He told us in 1803 (ant. 52)
 that in himself had been found
 the worthy inheritor and able
 representative of the peculiar
 attainments of his progenitor,
 the great *Charles O’Conor*;
 that of his Latin work, *Rerum*
Hybarnicarum Scriptores, &c.
 in that year, 1803, part was in
 the press, and much progress
 had been made in decyphering,
 translating, &c. In 1811 (4
 Col. 13) he refers to p. cxii.
 of his *Epistle præf.* to the
 Irish annals. In 1810 (3 Col.
 60) he treats his readers with
 a tantalizing *antepast* of his
 Latin *prologomena*: and (p.
 82. ib.) sends his reader for in-
 struction to a MS. work of his
on the religion of the pagan
Irish of the 5th century.—

quence to Ireland. *Quere!* Can the present Librarian to the Most No-
 ble Marquis of Buckingham state *in verbo sacerdotis*, what that appeal
 cost, which he made to the Pope from the late Dr. French’s order to him
 to return to his Parish under his obligation of the Ludovisian Oath, after
 his leave of absence (say six Months) had expired, and which was decid-
 ed by Cardinal Gerdil, Prefect to the Sacred Congregation *de propa-*
ganda fide against the apellant?

WALSH.

His antagonist Arch-bishop Talbot (F. D. 71) addressed him. "Indeed Mr. Walsh I
 " was much surprized to see
 " you remit English readers
 " (for the confutation of these
 " accusations) into your Latin
 " *Hybernica*, a book not as
 " yet published, and when
 " printed, not understood by
 " the English nation." Nicholson, late Bishop of Carlisle, in his Irish Historical Dictionary, "takes notice of Peter
 " Walsh's *Prospect of the*
 " *State of Ireland* from the
 " year of the World 1756 to
 " the year of Christ 1652."—
 " The first lines of this work
 were drawn at the request of the Earl of Castlehaven, whilst his memoirs were in the press and intended for an Appendix to them. New matter crowding in upon him, and the Earl having released him from the method, whereto he he had first confined him, he resolved to divide his work into two parts. In the first, which was all that was ever printed,

O'CONOR.

N. B. Not one of the above-mentioned works is as yet (1812) before the public (to my knowledge).

Many persons, though not enemies to Columbanus, have thought, that it would let the interested part of the public more into the real knowledge of the ancient history of the country, were the ancient Irish annals translated into English than into Latin: a dead language not now more cultivated in England or Ireland, than in the days of Peter Walsh. The translation of ancient chronicles from Celtic MSS. the characters of which are almost as obsolete and obscure as those of Persipolis (p. 23) into a dead language, and then from that dead language, of which the translator appears from the specimen he has chosen to give us of his proficiency in the Roman tongue, (3 Col. 60) to be no great adept, into a living language, in which he is notoriously incorrect, obscure and deficient, must remove the genuine meaning and spirit of the original further from our sight, than the first translation probably would. Of his own *defici-*

WALSH.

he represents the state of the whole island and its inhabitants from the first plantation after the flood till the English conquest. The man writes somewhat confusedly, intermixing long occasional stories with the main thread of his narrative; but seems not to have omitted any thing of consequence, that's advanced by either of his aforesaid vouchers (*Keating* and *Lynch*.) This honest Father Walsh is that same modern historian, upon whom Mr. O'Flaherty has let fly a whole chapter of remarks, for his pretending to criticism in the Irish language, when he speaks of *Ængus'* surname of *Ol-muchadh*, those of Malcolm, O'Bryen, O'Neil, Kairnes, &c. This severe treatment probably discouraged the author from publishing his 2d part."

O'CONOR.

encies in stile, he was or affected to be conscious on the 17th of March, 1810, (adv. to *Col. ad Hib.*) but which he hoped would be *supplied by strict adherence to historical documents*. "His object is, "without scrupulous regard to "refinements of language or "elegance of style, to expose "the fallacy of doctrines, which "have been propagated in recent publications." Notwithstanding the ostentatious security he gave his countrymen (through Dodsley in 1803) that the loss of his grandfather and of General Vallancey would be more than amply supplied (*uno avulso, non deficit alter aureus*) in the *abilities, superior knowledge of the Irish language and indefatigable industry* of the Rev. Dr. O'Connor, yet was I assured in that same year from no mean authority, that "the grandson had not "made Irish literature his study above five or six years, "and could be but imperfectly acquainted with the ancient Irish language." (ant. p. 35.) *Quere*, What has discouraged or prevented the publication of any one of his long-promised works?

WALSH

Once was an infuriated *nuncio*; was often challenged in print to refute, whilst he had the power, the following charges, of having murdered five English Soldiers, at Johnston's-bridge in breach of faith and with incredible cruelty: of having seditiously preached to the people to resist the Marquis of Ormond after the proclamation of peace in 1646: of having approved in print of *Eno's* libel against the person and authority of Ormond, who, he alleged, intended the King's ruin, as well as theirs: of having wrested the Castle of Kilkenny out of the King's and Ormond's hands, and delivered it to the Nuncio: of having written with his own hand the first fatal excommunication, (afterwards put into the hands of Lord Berkley when Lord Lieutenant) and in the habit of his order stuck it up on the Castle Gate; whereby Kilkenny, being then the Key of Ireland, and the people being implacably exasperated against Ormond, the further distractions and miseries were produced: yet none of these circumstances are even

O'CONOR

Was supposed and reported to be more favourably disposed towards the original union of Irishmen of all denominations in one common cause of emancipation, than may be now political or prudent for him to admit. I shall not attempt to particularize any charge: and silence may probably be his best panegyric. He refers indeed to a *period of extreme political intemperance (antea.29)* and *when the minds of all our body were exceedingly agitated*; he talks of a *haste*, which could only be justified by good intention, and of *his labours to pursue the truth*, and of his subsequent sorrow, that any result of his researches should have appeared. In none of his numerous publications does he specify the time, the occasion, the reasons, or the circumstances of his extraordinary conversion, and vocation to become a vessel of election to his countrymen. He refers to the circumstance, but not to the time, when *there fell from his eyes, as it were scales, and he received sight forthwith*, and *the rouge was washed off*, and *the wrinkles appeared*

WALSH.

obliquely touched or hinted at in any of his subsequent voluminous writings: no mention made of the time, grounds, or circumstances of his conversion, or of his vocation to become a chosen vessel to the nation, *to open their eyes and to turn them from darkness to light..* “Nor indeed” (says Arch-bishop Talbot, “Fr. Dis. 66) could this age, “so, infamous for murders and “rebellions against lawful sovereigns expect so *apostolic a reformer*, as P. Walsh hath “proved himself to be.”

It was objected to him by Arch-bishop Talbot, (Fr. Dis. 91) “Now *Redmond Caron* “and *you* were resolved to be “Bishops; the one of Armagh,

O'CONOR.

more disgusting, the less they were perceived before. Dropping or keeping in the background the whole circumstance of his conversion, he seeks notoriety in the destruction of those, with whom he might be supposed to have associated, and proves the ardor of his new zeal by administering to his readers a draught so powerfully revolting, that none but his own, and some few of like digestive powers, (*O dura messorum illia*) could withstand. (antea. p. 143) He modestly assumes the appellation of *Columbanus*, from his sincere catholicity, his enmity to the intrigues of Popes and Nuncios, his distinguishing the abuses of courts and the superstitions of the vulgar from the genuine doctrines of the Catholic Church. “Well then “may we wonder” as Arch-bishop Talbot said to Walsh, “*God did not sooner send a “holy man to reform these “enormous errors.*” (F.D.66)

A year had elapsed, (3 Col. 1) since his brother had written to him to assist his endeavours for his promotion to succeed Dr. French, then

WALSH.

“ the other of Dublin: you
 “ despaired of obtaining miters
 “ by your merit and the ordi-
 “ nary wayes: therefore you
 “ resolved to fright the Court
 “ of Rome into it by setting
 “ up this your remonstrance:
 “ and intruding yourselves in-
 “ to ecclesiastical and state af-
 “ fairs,” in which they were
 encouraged by the Ministry of
 that day, “ for reasons best
 “ knowen to themselves, and
 “ common to all statesmen,
 “ which they foresaw would
 “ divide the Catholics amongst
 “ themselves, discredit their re-
 “ ligion, and give the govern-
 “ ment the color and advan-
 “ tage of excluding from their
 “ estates many meriting gen-
 “ tlemen.”

O'CONOR.

holding the See of Elphin.—
 He wrote to Dr. Troy and Dr.
 Moylan, that it was his final
 determination not to use *any*
influence whatever in the pro-
secution of that design. He
 was privy to the Marquis of
 Buckingham's declining to in-
 terfere: he lamented (3 Col. 16)
 that the Irish gentry and no-
 bility had not made any inte-
 rest in his favor. His diocesan
 clergy had been reminded of
his merits. YOU KNOW HIM.
 (antea p. 129) Then forsak-
 ing the ordinary way of draw-
 ing jurisdiction from the Pope,
 he proclaims *in terrorem Romæ*
 (1 Col. 79) “ That the elec-
 “ tion of the clergy with the
 “ approbation of the gentry
 “ and the confirmation of the
 “ civil power is the only pru-
 “ dent, the only wise, the only
 “ constitutional and only ca-
 “ tholic plan, that in the pre-
 “ sent circumstances can be
 “ adopted by the Irish peo-
 “ ple.” For, (1 Col. 80)
 “ neither the *election* of Bi-
 “ shops by the Pope, nor their
 “ *confirmation* by him after
 “ *election*, nor their *nomina-*
 “ *tion* to any vacant See, nor
 “ the Pope's *consent*, nor even

WALSH.

(W. Hist. Rem. xliii) "No-
 " thing less than (nor yet any
 " such thing as a) design to
 " undervalue the miracles re-
 " ported on any sufficient
 " ground to be wrought either
 " in former or later times by
 " any saint or person of the
 " Roman church induced me
 " to give that large account of
 " the famed wonder-working
 " Irish priest *James Fienachty*
 " besides the duty of an *histo-*
 " *rian*, which might even alone
 " require, that *narrative* in this
 " very place, I had also all the
 " reason in the world to invite
 " me to give it: that Protestants
 " may be convinced, there are
 " yet remaining of the *Roman*
 " *Church*, at least even *Irish*
 " *Ecclesiastics*, that desire not
 " to maintain the truths of
 " *Christianity* or *Catholicism*
 " by cheats, or tricks and lies,
 " and mountebankries."

O'CONOR.

" his *knowledge* of the *ap-*
 " *pointment* is a necessary re-
 " quisite to establish the *vali-*
 " *dity* of any of these acts."
 (3 Col. 43) "The Irish al-
 " ways appointed their own
 " bishops without so much as
 " the knowledge of Rome."
 (3 Col. 77. 8.) "With re-
 " gard to St. Winefrid, I so-
 " lemnly protest, that a word
 " of disrespectful language to-
 " wards the person called St.
 " Winefrid never escaped my
 " lips. I recollect indeed, that
 " when the Bishop of Casta-
 " bala published his miraculous
 " pamphlet on the wonderful
 " cures performed at the Well
 " in Flintshire, commonly called
 " *St. Winefrid's*, I complained
 " to the good Bishop of the
 " London district, that false
 " miracles had always been a
 " source of infidelity. What
 " I complain of is, that the
 " Bishop of Castabala coun-
 " tenances supposed miracu-
 " lous cures, which contributes
 " to shake the faith of weak
 " brethren in the genuine mi-
 " racles of primitive times."
 (2 Col. viii.) "There are o-
 " thers, who suppose from the

WALSH.

(3 Let. to Ferns 97) "Neither divine nor human right
 " had made him (the Pope) an
 " authoritative judge to bind
 " her (the Church). That
 " speaking precisely *de jure*
 " all bishops and churches
 " of the earth are co-ordinate
 " and *Reggium* and *Rochester*
 " equal to Rome." (Let. to
 Barlow 275) " They attribute
 " only *primatum* a primacy of
 " power *over the whole world*,
 " not a *supremacy*, and conse-
 " quently neither a vicarship
 " nor headship, nor a fulness,
 " nor indeed any measure at
 " all of that, which is in reality
 " and properly or strictly
 " called *jurisdictional power*
 " to the Pope as given to him
 " by Christ in Peter to govern
 " the universal church."

He holds it " Not to be the
 " doctrine of the Roman Ca-
 " tholic Church, (Pref. 5 sect.)

O'CONOR.

" foolish productions of some
 " of our writers, that Catho-
 " licity is a system of anility,
 " fit only for vulgar or imbe-
 " cil minds, a belief in hob-
 " goblinism, witchcraft, fabu-
 " lous miracles, and legendary
 " tales."

(3 Col. 109.) " As Bishop,
 " his power does not extend
 " beyond the limits of his
 " diocese of Rome, which he
 " must govern *canonically* with
 " the aid of his clergy. He
 " can exercise no episcopal
 " jurisdiction in the liminary
 " diocese of *Porto* or *Ostia*,
 " or *Albano*. Otherwise he
 " would be *Universal Bishop*."

(3 Col. 112.) " This primacy
 " being a spiritual and not a
 " temporal power, can exert
 " itself visibly only, when *faith*
 " or *morals* are visibly vio-
 " lated, by declaring the vio-
 " lators separated from the
 " communion of the apostolic
 " church, and ordaining *canon-*
 " *ically*, that other teachers and
 " preachers may be substituted
 " in their stead."

(3 Col. 113) " Even in
 " quality of primate the Pope's
 " power is not absolute. He

WALSH.

“ that the Pope is either infal-
 “ lible, or at all the supreme
 “ judge of controversies aris-
 “ ing in her &c. I desire them
 “ before hand to consider on-
 “ ly this brief passage of the
 “ *truly Catholic* and learned
 “ Richerius in his history of
 “ the general councils. (Conc.
 “ 1. 4. part 1. pag. 34) In
 “ the days of yore and primitive
 “ church even the Bishop of
 “ Rome’s decree was reviewed
 “ in the Provincial Synod:
 “ which was held every year
 “ twice: and so the church tri-
 “ bunals were open to all: not
 “ as they are now a-days, with
 “ extreme injury, by absolute
 “ power shut, which power the
 “ Pope arrogates to himself over
 “ all churches: and in imitation
 “ of the Pope, all Bishops do
 “ in their turn, arrogate over
 “ all their inferiors, against
 “ the law of God and nature,
 “ and thus monarchically they
 “ decree all things by the ad-
 “ vice of a few persons, and
 “ so not only strengthen the
 “ old schisms, but open the
 “ way for new.”

O’CONOR.

“ cannot decide controversies.”
 “ It was not then and cannot
 “ now be the doctrine of the
 “ Catholic Church, that the
 “ Pope’s decision, even as pri-
 “ mate, however respectable,
 “ is sufficient to *decide* con-
 “ troversies respecting articles
 “ of faith.” (3 Col. 20)—
 “ Those persons, who former-
 “ ly would have shrunk from
 “ *exclusive* empire, as subver-
 “ sive of our hierarchy, and
 “ *heretical*, have publickly
 “ announced, that they exclu-
 “ sively have a right to discuss
 “ all matters appertaining to
 “ the doctrines and disciplines
 “ of the Roman Catholic
 “ Church!” (3 Col. 111)—
 “ The Catholic Religion, as
 “ professed in Ireland, can
 “ never be fairly represented
 “ by the body of our clergy,
 “ as long as our church is un-
 “ der the influence of a foreign
 “ power, as long as our Bi-
 “ shops intrigue for prefer-
 “ ment in foreign courts, as
 “ long as our church govern-
 “ ment is managed by exclusive
 “ Synods, and our second or-
 “ der of clergy, nobility and

WALSH.

O'CONOR.

“ gentry are deprived of their
 “ necessary controul. (4 Col.
 84) “ Were we aware, a few
 “ years ago, that our Bishops
 “ would ever dream of exclud-
 “ ing from our Synods all but
 “ themselves? Of claiming an
 “ exclusive right of discussion
 “ and judgment in all matters
 “ of faith and discipline, (3
 Col. 22) the doctrine of ex-
 “ clusive discussion, advanced
 “ by Castabala, is *heretical*.”
 He sides with the church of (5 Col. 125) “ It may pos-
 England in objecting against “ sibly be argued that the coun-
 the council of Trent.* (3 letter “ cil of Trent has been received

* When a tenacious uniformity in strong error pervades individuals through a course of two centuries, it is evident, that the common tie of such erroneous opinion is systematic; and unless, therefore, the whole system be rooted up, the refutation, condemnation, or even punishment of the single error, be it ever so dangerous, will only encrease the contumacy, sharpen the zeal, and multiply the artifices of the leading members of the system, to mask, fortify, and preserve the rest of it more successfully. The direct opposition to God's revealed truth, is resistance to the authority he has commissioned to teach it. To this is traceable that prominent feature of Jansenism, contemptuous hostility to the council of Trent. Abbe St. Cyran, the founder of that subtle and pernicious sect in France, held it to be only a political convention, and in no shape a true council; a mere assemblage of some school divines by the Pope, where there was nothing but intrigue and cabal. The manifestation of this symptom proves the prevalence of the disorder at this hour. Would to God, the remedy were as obvious, as the disease is evident. No man professes himself a Jansenist. We can discern them only by their fruits, as the Baptist did the Pharisees and Saducees: *O generation of Vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring therefore fruits meet for repentance.* (Matt. 3. 7.) I tremble and shudder at the ravages,

WALSH.

O'CONOR.

from Walsh to the Bishop of Fernes, 103) "That it was "by France and Ireland, be-
 "neither œcumenical, nor oc- "cause the doctrines defined
 "by that council are admitted

which I see that terrible disorder making amongst some of the Catholic flocks within the dominions of His Majesty. But as insensibility of infection and danger is one general symptom of the disorder, I yield to more, even than my *historical duty*, in sounding the alarm, in manifesting the progress and mischief of the disease, and in warning every pastor of a Catholic flock throughout the British Empire, that there is infinitely less danger of destruction to their flocks, from the overt errors of Arians, Socinians, Calvinists, Lutherans, or any avowed separatists, than from the disguised poison of the Jansenists, who with unrelenting perseverance lurk among the Catholics, concealing their infection under an ostentatious display of external purity, with a view to indulge their lust for seduction, in the true spirit of their insidious founder. Jansenius, in his 60th letter to his Co-Evangelist St. Cyran, said of three of their chosen disciples recommended and well received at the then Spanish Court of Bruxelles, "It will be proper to find them, if possible, a place in the middle of the University, without giving any reason for it: for I design to make all the youth fall by degrees into their hands." Unavowed seduction under external sanctimony ever has been a sure *diagnostic* of the *lues Janseniana*.

I have before alluded to the introduction to our laws, of a description of persons wholly unknown to them before, the protesting Catholic Dissenters by an indefatigable co-operator of Columbanus. Whilst that legal Master of the Ceremonies officially introduces these strangers to our laws under their new and foreign titles, I humbly beg leave to stand by as a *Drogeman* to the Mahomedan foreign influence establishment, occasionally to interpret the language of those strangers, which is not currently understood in any of our Courts, whether Christian or civil, of equity, conscience, honor or dignity. I have had several opportunities of studying the origin and progress, the occasional improvements, and modern refined niceties of their tongue. I was impelled to that study by something like *invincible Grace*; from almost an innate reprobation of the principles, execration of the Spirit, and abhorrence of the practices of *Jansenism*. Under these impressions I am sensible of the awful and double duty I have to perform both to Church and State. I submit to the indispensable obligation, under which God's ordinances place me as to both. Though each be supreme and independent of the other, so

WALSH.

O'CONOR.

“cidental, nor free.” (Ib. “and taught by both.—Most
110) “There was neither side “delectable logick! Most won-
“nor bench in it, but of men, “derful sagacity! France and

little do the two powers jostle or clash with each other in this instance, that a single act completely satisfies the double obligation. That act is to put in print and circulate as widely as I can, the source, principles, spirit, doctrines, designs, practices, connections, means, power, influence and conduct of a description of persons wholly unknown to the laws, and of such as Columbanus labours so enthusiastically to make his countrymen become. I warn my reader, perhaps *ex abundanti Cautelâ*, that in speaking of Jansenism, I do it *historically*, not *theologically*. It is chiefly therefore, for the information of the civil Magistrate, whom without any disrespect, I assume to be in great ignorance upon the subject, that I state the leading doctrine, or their noted five propositions, their New Lights, their spirit and modes of proselytizing, their persevering energies, their numbers, their influence, their trust funds or stock purse, their emissaries, their disciples, their teachers, their evangelists, their use and abuse of tests and formularies, their secret engagements and intrigues, their overt and covert connections, their opposition to the established religion of the state, whatever it be, in as far as it differs from their doctrines. From this information will he be enabled to square his policy and conduct, by countenancing these old novelties, by extending Methodism (the Jansenism of the established church) and by creating a moral certainty of renewing in the 19th, many of the religious horrors of the 16th, 17th, and 18th Centuries.

CORNELIUS JANSENS, a Native of Holland; was born in 1585, and went to Paris in 1604, after having studied at Utrecht and Louvain. In France he became intimate with the famous *John Verdeger de Haurane*, better known by the appellation of *Abbe de St. Cyran*, the bosom friend, confidant, adviser, and fellow-labourer with Jansen in establishing the new doctrine. Returning to Louvain in 1617, he took the degree of Doctor of Divinity, was made head of the College of St. Pulcheria, and obtained a professorship of Holy Scriptures in that University. He was deputed and succeeded in procuring from the King of Spain, a prohibition to the Jesuites to teach humanity and philosophy in that University; and upon the treaty of alliance, which France was about to enter into with the Protestant Powers, he published a small book, called *Mars Gallicus*, very injurious to France, and grossly insulting to their kings: for which he was nominated by Philip IV. of Spain to be

WALSH.

O'CONOR.

“ that were bond-men to the “ Ireland held these doctrines
 “ Pope, as well by virtue of the “ before the council of Trent
 “ aforesaid oath of vassalage “ was known. Is it because

Bishop of Ipres, in 1636. He died in that see in 1638, of the plague, or according to some of a putrid fever. The famous book, which contains his peculiar heresies, is called his *Augustinus*; and thence were extracted the five propositions, condemned at Rome and by the Gallican church, which made so much noise and disturbance in France in the two last centuries. The propositions are submitted to the reader, in order, that he may compare them with the doctrines, which in the present day are professed, countenanced, favoured, and encouraged by the modern evangelical preachers of the New Light; who though termed *Methodists* or *Swadlers* by others, like the Jansenists reject and disclaim any distinctive appellation; meaning collectively and individually to remain in the enjoyment and communication of all the good things of the establishment, they pretend to nothing more than extraordinary purity in the religion established, and therefore treat the idea of their being a sect as a phantom, and feel the application of a distinctive denomination as insult and injury.

1st Proposition. Some of God's Commandments are impossible to just persons, who desire and endeavour to the utmost of their power to keep them: they also want that grace, by which they may become possible to be kept.

2d. Prop. In the state of corrupt nature, no one can resist interior grace.

3d. Prop. To merit and demerit in the state of corrupt nature, we do not stand in need of liberty, free from a necessity to act; but it is enough, that it be free from constraint.

4th Prop. The *Semipelagians* admitted the necessity of an interior preventing grace for every action in particular, even those required for the first act of faith: and they were heretics in as much, as they pretended this grace to be of such a nature, that the human will had power either to resist or consent to it.

5th Prop. It is *Semipelagianism* to say, that Christ died or shed his blood for all men.

True it is, that the first of these five propositions is the only one, that is contained in the *Augustinus* in direct and express terms: but the plain meaning of the other four is extracted from, as it is diffused through the author's whole system of Divinity upon predestination and grace, of

WALSH.

O'CONOR.

“made unto him, as by reason “they were defined in the 16th
 “of their manifold dependen- “century, that they were be-
 “cies on him almost in all “lieved and taught in the 6th?

which Bossuet, whose learned and inflexible orthodoxy frown indignant defiance against the *bene & naviter impudentem*, thus spoke, *Put but that Augustinus in an alembick, and you'll extract nothing else, but the five propositions.* Grievously do they err, who imagine, that the Jansenian errors have died with their inventors: In fact, the *Augustinus* was only published two years after the author's death, viz. 1640, and was condemned by Urban VIII. on the 16th of March, 1641. To allay the dreadful animosity of the party, eighty-eight Gallican prelates compressed the substance of the new heresy into the five propositions, which Innocent X. denounced in 1650. The cry of the party being violent against the damnatory bull of Innocent, a special congregation was instituted in 1651, to examine and report upon the five propositions, and after thirty-six sittings, at the ten last of which of four hours each, his holiness attended in person, they were formally condemned, and the bull of condemnation was sent to all the Catholic crowned heads of Europe. The condemnation of each separate proposition is as follows.

1st Prop. “Is rash, impious, blasphematory, anathematized, and heretical.”

2d Prop. “Is heretical.”

3d Prop. “Is heretical.”

4th Prop. “Is false and heretical.”

5th Prop. “Is false, rash and scandalous; and if taken in this sense, “that Jesus Christ died only for the salvation of the predestinated, it is “impious, blasphematory, injurious and derogatory to the goodness of “God and heretical.” The bull was executed under sanction of letters patent from Louis XIV. and registered in the Sorbonne. It is very important for every one, who gives any credit to Valesian, Columbanian, or other assertions concerning the limited jurisdiction of the Pope to remark, that in the letter written to thank his holiness for having issued that bull for the safety of the Church, and preservation of the faith by the thirty prelates, who were at Paris at the time it was received, and met at Cardinal Mazarin's, contained the following words. “That the “judgments passed by the Vicar of Jesus Christ to strengthen the rule of “faith upon consultation with Bishops (whether their advice be inserted “therein or not) rest upon the divine and supreme authority, which he “has over the whole Church; an authority, to which all Christians are “obliged to submit their reason.”

WALSH.

O'CONOR.

“ things, whether of this world “ In order to prove, that the
 “ or the other.” Then, in or- “ council of Trent has been in
 der to prove the asserted law- “ any shape received by Ire-

Arnaud, Quesnel, and other leaders of the party (who on the death of St. Cyran in 1643, became the head and oracle of the Jansenian party) attempted to illude the effect of the condemnation of Innocent, by a subtle invented difference between *right* and *fact*: under which disguise or subterfuge they accommodated their consciences to subscribe the test or *formulary* of their submission to the condemnation, in order not to be shut out of faculties and benefices. Some of them appealed to a future general council: which was deferring the ultimate decision to a very long day;—*ad Calendas Græcas*. Arnaud inveighed as loudly and coarsely against the Pope's condemnation of the five propositions, as Columbanus does, and almost in the same words, against the papal condemnation of Quesnel's works. This evasive subtilty of the party forced the Pope to issue a decree in 1665, prescribing the following formulary or test, as excluding or preventing any evasion or equivocation. “ I, A.B. “ whose name is hereunto subscribed, submit to the Apostolical Constitu- “ tion of Innocent X the sovereign Pontiff, bearing date the 31st May, “ 1653, and to that of Alexander VII. his successor, of the 16th of “ October, 1656; and I reject and condemn sincerely the five propositions “ extracted from the book of Cornelius Jansens, intituled *Augustinus*, in “ the proper sense of the same author, as the apostolic See has con- “ demned the same constitutions. I swear it so. *So help me God.*”— This created a division in the party. The more rigid held, that this test or formula could not be sworn to without perjury. The less sincere, and by far the more numerous part of them swore, under the reserve, that though they might renounce the five propositions, they did not thereby forswear the doctrines of *Jansenius*. Under this or the like subterfuge they have generally ever since taken and subscribed different formularies or tests, which were framed for the purpose of keeping them out of the ministry, and all Church preferment. Upon similar principles have some *bold men* recommended to all his Majesty's Catholic subjects to take the oath of supremacy, in order to let themselves into great civil benefits, from which recusants were evidently intended to be shut and barred out by that very test or formulary; for King James said truly; “ the oath “ of supremacy was devised for putting a difference between papists and “ them of our profession.”

Irishmen and Englishmen, governors of the Church, and rulers of the State “ Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing,

WALSH.

O'CONOR.

fulness of appealing from the *Pope and Trent* together, besides the argument drawn from

“land, we must prove, that it
“has been publicly promulga-
“ted and received by a national

“but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by
“their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?”—
(Matt. vii. 15.) Jansenism, from the beginning to this hour, has never
boldly, manfully and explicitly avowed it's own tenets: it has fed on
deception, it has thriven by prevarication. Allowing it an existence
of two full centuries, by tracing it's spirit and practices at the middle
period, and finding them in perfect unison with the overture and finale,
we may rest satisfied of having discovered all the genuine airs, fugues,
turns, chromatics, variations, spirit and harmony of the whole composi-
tion. Pope Clement XI. was unquestionably a man of great learning,
wisdom and virtue. He is not of the Columbian calendar. *Saints,*
however respectable for learning and sanctity, are often great fools (2 Col. vi. vii.)
He it was, who published in 1713 the celebrated Constitution or bull
Unigenitus, which has been received by the whole Catholic church diffu-
sively, against one hundred and seven false propositions of Quesnel, which
we have before noticed. In his bull *Vineam Domini Sabaoth*, which he
issued in 1705 against those, who maintained the five propositions, and
who pretended, that by a respectful silence they satisfied their duty of
submission to the apostolic bulls and decrees, he gives the following pic-
ture of Jansenian lubricity, insincerity and dissimulation. “These tur-
“bulent spirits have every where dispersed books and libels written
“with a design to ensnare: wherein by an attempt injurious to the holy
“See apostolic, and to the great scandal of the whole Church, they have
“had the boldness to teach, that for the rendering the obedience due
“to the said apostolic decrees, 'tis not necessary to condemn interiorly
“the sense of Jansenius's book as heretical, which is the sense condemned
“in the five propositions; but that it is enough on that point for them to
“be, (as they term it) respectfully silent.” “It is also notorious, that
“some persons have been transported to such an excess of impudence,
“that forgetting not only Christian sincerity, but in some measure the
“sense of natural honor audaciously affirmed, that the formulary ap-
“pointed by Alexander VII. might lawfully be signed even by those
“persons, who in their hearts did not judge the aforesaid book of Jan-
“senius to contain heretical doctrine. We, by the same authority apos-
“tolic, in virtue of these presents, which shall remain in force for ever, do
“decree, declare, appoint and ordain, that this respectful silence is not
“sufficient proof of the obedience due to the apostolic decree herein in-
“serted: but that all the faithful ought to reject and condemn as hereti-

WALSH.

O'CONOR.

ancient times, he urges the doctrine and practice of those very ages and men, whom we all re-

“ synod, legitimately convened
“ to consider and discuss that
“ subject, and to report and

“ cal, not *with the mouth only, but from the heart*, the sense of Jansenius’
“ book, the sense condemned in the five propositions aforesaid, and that
“ which their proper terms, as before mentioned, at first offer to the un-
“ derstanding: and that the formulary can not be lawfully subscribed in
“ any other sense, disposition or belief.” Thus did that great Pastor endeavour to guard his flock not only against the deliterious venom of Jansenian doctrine, but also against the ensnaring mischief and dangers of Jansenian duplicity, impudence and prevarication.

Although each of my readers may not hold himself conscientiously bounden to yield absolute and blind submission to Papal decrees, though assented to by the dispersed churches, as the bull *Unigenitus* has been; yet few, or none but the professed Jansenists, and their much more numerous secret abettors, will conceive it possible, that a person combining with the official influence which the Pontifical Primacy gave him over Christendom, the confidence, estimation and credit ever attendant upon learning, high birth and experience, should, in the eyes of the Christian world, solemnly issue an act or instrument stained and debased by notorious falsehoods. To my reader, therefore, I submit the following passage extracted from a brief of Clement XI. to the Catholics of Holland, as *historical evidence* of the quality of Jansenism in the middle period of its career. “ They affect an exterior more
“ reformed, and are glad to pass for doctors of severe morals: but every
“ wise man easily sees their true notions and designs by the application
“ of that certain rule, which our Saviour gave us, to discern such as
“ hide themselves under the cloathing of sheep. You will know them
“ by their works. For to say no more, when we observe so many li-
“ bels, as they have printed about the present debate, filled with injuries
“ and slanders, lies and calunnies, wherein their temerity and contempt
“ of the holy See openly appear, and is known to have given scandal
“ even to heretics themselves: when we observe, I say, these libels,
“ don’t we presently observe, that their authors and abettors are far
“ from having the spirit of God, who is the God of peace and not of
“ dissention: that they are far from having the true charity of Jesus
“ Christ, which they extol so much with their voice, and overthrow
“ by their actions: that in short they are very far from the way of
“ true humility and true obedience, which are the grounds of other
“ virtues.”

WALSH.

O'CONOR.

verence, and presses hard the old belief or persuasion of the fallibility even of the most æcu- “promulgate accordingly. Now “the first-rate Catholic Theo- “logians absolutely deny, that

An anonymous writer about the middle age of Jansenism, speaks as a cotemporary historian of the Jansenists of his day. His book, as translated from the French, was published by Lewis, of Russel-Street, Covent-Garden, in 1714, under the title of *Familiar Instructions about Predestination and Grace, by way of Question and Answer*, and in demonstration of the truth, fidelity and judgment of that author, I select the following lines, from (p. 115) which delineate the system and the spirit, doctrines and practices of it's followers with as minute precision and unbiassed judgment, as if they had been written in 1812, as a Comment upon, or Exposition of the five numbers of Columbanus.

“How Jansenists may be distinguished before they come to make a “separate body from the Church.”

“L. (i. e. Layman) How can we know them before they declare their “opinions? For people often come to discover them too late, and after “they have been prepossessed by them?”

“D. (i. e. Divine) Even for this reason people can't be too attentive “to distinguish the true pastors from the great number of wolves that “look like them.”

“L. Persons of that character are dextrous in disguising them- “selves, and it is not always an easy matter to be certain, what “they are.”

“D. To believe a pastor or director a Jansenist, you must be sure he “is so: but not to trust yourself in his hands, it is enough to be uncer- “tain, whether he be or not. Here then is the rule, I would recommend “upon this point to Catholics. Believe no man a Jansenist, if you have “not convincing proofs: but give up your conscience to no body, whom “you are not perfectly sure of.”

“L. I would add to this rule the signs, by which one might discover a “Jansenist, that conceals himself.”

“D. You may trace them by their esteem of and attachment to cer- “tain persons, that are notoriously of their party: by their crying “up, and putting into your hands condemned books; by the extraordi- “nary practices, that you will see them introduce in the administration “of penance and the eucharist: by certain hints, that drop from them “against the Pope, Bishops and Prince: by the little moderation they “shew in speaking of them, who most avowedly oppose the doctrine of “Jansenius by the contempt, or at least indifference they have for most

WALSH.

O'CONOR.

menical synods truly such, what-
ever the subject of their decrees
be.

“ the council of Trent ever was
“ received in any sense, either
“ with respect to it's doctrines
“ or it's discipline, by the Gal-
“ lican church.”

“ of the pious and warrantable practices authorized by the church: by
“ their industry to lessen devotion towards our blessed Lady, and their
“ weakening the force of the encomiums given her by the church: by
“ their affectation in preaching up an over-severe morality, and in sigh-
“ ing upon the relaxation of the primitive discipline.”

L. “ To form a judgment of these signs, the number of *Jansenists* is
“ very considerable at this day, and a state may apprehend every thing
“ from a new heresie: 'tis at the beginning, a fire raked up in the em-
“ bers, but may hereafter break out into a great flame.”

I openly and loudly profess my wishes and intention; but lament that
I can not strengthen my feeble efforts to extinguish the fire concealed
under the treacherous embers, ere it burst forth into a flame, that may
reduce the better part of the empire to annihilation. I publish, to make
known the danger both to Church and State: and earnestly invoke every
individual, who tenders the purity of Catholic faith and Church govern-
ment, and has at heart the perfection and consequent permanency of the
British constitution to back my feeble, though earnest energies to prevent
the evil. I am well aware that,

Periculosæ plenum opus aleæ

Tractas, & incedis per ignes

Suppositos cineri doloso. Hor. 2L. 1 Ode.

Ardent in hopes to save my native land,

A work of desp'rate chance I take in hand.

Too confident, perhaps, I heedless tread

On fire, with treach'rous embers overspread.

Some few more unequivocal symptoms of Jansenism from their mesne
period, will prove not uninteresting to those who may not have had
the opportunity, or even thought of unravelling some very perplexed
intricacies, of analyzing some very noxious, though artfully mixed up
potions, and of combining certain pernicious principles, practices and
analogies of the three last centuries. The last-mentioned author says,
(p. 19) “ Jansenius' disciples beheld the disciples of *MOLINOS* arise
“ amongst them, and doubtless for this reason, that one and t'other found
“ at Rome the same friends, the same protectors, and the same adver-

These parallels will, I hope, convince every unbiassed reader that I did not assert or suggest a similarity of situation, spirit and doctrine in these two oppugners of Popes and synods, *without proof*. I further crave his courteous indulgence to

"series. A QUIETIST is properly speaking a JANSENIST, that drawing
 "fair consequences from his Master's principles, about the necessity of
 "doing ill, concludes, that he himself does not sin by doing it, and so
 "abandons himself, without the least disturbance, to the most frightful
 "disorders." Between the years 1670 and 1680, it was the intention
 of the party to establish a *National Church*, independent of and unconnected with Rome, and therefore they applied a large portion of their funds or stock-purse in the purchase of land in a small Danish island called Nordstrand. But that project quickly presented difficulties, which were no sooner perceived than the scheme was abandoned. It would have thrown them into an insulated and separate body, and consequently shut them out of their great means of proselytizing, by insinuation, under cover and with the advantages of a regular ministry and legal benefices. They accordingly sold back to the Duke of Holstein their lands in Nordstrand, for 50,000 crowns, which the Duke was to pay, not all in ready money, but by instalments. In the year 1695, Mr. Nicole (a leading man of the party) bequeathed to Madame de Fontpertuis (the Lady Huntingdon of her day) the remainder of the debt, that fell to his share. The bequest was made by a codicil to his will in these words: "I bequeath to Madame de Fontpertuis all that
 "may accrue to me, as well principal as interest, from the Duke of
 "Holstein, for the purchase he made of the lands we sold him in common, situate in the island of Nordstrand, by contract signed and delivered in the presence of Boucher & Lorimier notaries, of the Chatelet at Paris, the 18th or 20th November, 1678." It is to be remarked, that this Nicole, though he never could be prevailed upon to take Priest's orders, was a most zealous leader of the party; he cooperated with Arnauld in defending Jansenism, and was the founder of the trust fund, deposit or stock-purse, called *La boette a Perette*, so instrumental in forwarding the interests of the party; which in 1781 yielded annually 40,000 livres, according to the memorial of President Rolland, who complains of having been virtually disinherited by his uncle from the large legacies, which he left to this fund. He there says of himself, that the affair of the Jesuits had cost him above 60,000 livres out of his own pocket, and in truth, adds he, the labours I underwent, and particularly after the Jesuits, who would not have been abolished, if I had not devoted to that purpose my time, my health and my money, ought not to have brought upon me disherison by my uncle.

throw an impartial eye over the few remaining pages, which I trust will satisfy him, that I did not without reason or proof aver or assume, that the author of the famous blue-books published against the power and jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome,

The transactions of the party in Holland about the middle period of Jansenism have too strong analogies to the late insidious and covert efforts to *nationalize* the English and Irish Catholic Churches to be passed over unnoticed. By the reformation the hierarchy had become extinguished in Holland, as it had in England: and the Catholics were there subjected as they are in England, to apostolic vicars, having episcopal jurisdiction and being bishops *in partibus*. Amongst these Jansenism had made violent progress. Peter Codde, the Arch-bishop of Sebaste, in 1711, died in the most hardened profession of Jansenism, and received the Sacraments from the hands of a Mr. Cattus, who for his like profession of Jansenism had been deprived of his faculties by the Pope, and was under interdict; of course disqualified for the ministry; or in that state, in which Columbanus says, without mission, he could not validly administer the sacraments. Then says the same anonymous author, p. 110.

L. "Is there no vicar apostolic in the place of the arch-bishop of Sebaste?"

D. "The Pope had named one, who was very much to the liking of the party, but he lived very few days: His Holiness has since named another. But the States, whom these gentlemen have engaged in their interest, refuse to receive him. In short it appears, they are resolved to have a vicar of the new sect, or none at all: that is to say, they are resolved to push affairs to extremity and throw off the yoke of Rome."

L. "But do the Jansenists of France join with them in all this?"

D. "Yes; and it is clearly proved in the letters just now mentioned. This body is in effect animated with the same spirit, that acts in the different parts, and sets every spring in motion. But when the Jansenists of Holland will have set up a Church apart, under the State's protection, their brethren, that are too much streightened elsewhere, will run thither in crowds to taste the first fruits of the liberty they heretofore would have sought for beyond seas at Nordstrand."

L. "Behold the new law of St. Cyran well advanced, and his new church in great forwardness."

D. "Unhappily it is built upon the ruins of the true church: the only pastors, that might have maintained the faithful in union with the Vicar of Jesus Christ, are banished Holland: and an infinity of zealous Catholics are going to be the prey of wolves in sheep's cloathing."

and Columbanus, were *duo laborantes in Unum*. (3 Vol. Hist. Ir. 820.)

Vainly has Columbanus, as before observed, endeavoured to draw off his theological pursuers by misquoting Dr. Pointer's words (4 Col. 7): his wealds and forests, his *paludi e selve hirsuti* (2 Col. 83) superabound with Columbanian destructive game: and it is hoped, they will not relax their earnestness, whilst objects of their pursuit still remain to be hunted down. I rejoice to have caught him towards the close of the chace, tripping or stumbling very unexpectedly into a track of orthodoxy of prime importance. (5 Col. 121) "If it should be objected, that the council of Trent has ordained it so, I answer, that this is one of a thousand demonstrations, that councils are not infallible (*except in articles of faith*). To such only, I admit does Christ's promise of infallibility attach; as I have laboured to shew throughout my Church and State, particularly in the 7th chapter of the 2d book, intituled "Of the compatibility of the Roman Catholic's doctrine of the infallibility of the church with the observance of their oath and their civil duties to the state." There I said (p. 221) "A man ceases to be a Roman Catholic, who ceases to believe, that Jesus Christ promised to teach all truth to his church till the end of time: consequently, that the faith, which she now teaches, is the same, which he revealed to his apostles: and therefore that *in declaring his revealed doctrine*, the church can not err, or deceive us. The inerrancy, therefore, of the church, according to the true and fair exposition of Roman Catholic doctrine, is nothing more nor less, than the promise of God to preserve and continue the identity of that faith, which Christ revealed, and taught whilst upon earth, and his apostles after his ascension preached to all nations." But

Quid non mortalia pectora cogis

Auri sacra fames?

To what excesses of a rav'ning mind

Does holy lust of mitre drive mankind?

Friar Peter Walsh, professor of divinity in the 17th, and the Rev. C. O'Connor doctor of divinity in the 19th century, both of them fastidiously tenacious of their orthodoxy, both of them asserting the *jure divino* rights of priests to a special mission for resisting and reforming church abuses in their country, both claiming the advanced post in approximating the Catholic church of Rome to the reformed church of England, both preaching up the duty incumbent upon every true son of the church (Pref. to Let. 7.) to *vindicate her from the imposture of zealots and set her once right in the opinion of Protestants*, both having been foiled in their wishes to obtain an Irish mitre, hoist the flag of *Anti-popery*, and formally enlist in their service the most violent oppugners of the holy See, who had signalized themselves in the ranks of that corps, which I have before remarked to be properly speaking the puritans of the Roman Catholic Church. A corps highly disciplined in the mixed tactics of John Calvin and Bishop Jansens: famed beyond all other corps for zeal, craft, address, versatility, extravagance, activity and perseverance in recruiting and proselytizing: and more renowned for their dexterity in surprizes, feints, ambuscades, mining, sapping, bush fighting, masking, and other refined *ruses de guerre*, than in open deeds of valor in the field. Like Orangemen, they are secretly confederated against Popery, whilst they affect greater purity of loyalty and religion than their neighbours, they profess their exclusive views to be, to give strength to one, and perfection to the other. They are hermetically closed against divulging the time, place or terms of their enlistment, who was their recruiting serjeant, who is their pay-master, who their commanding officer. Although circumstantial, accumulative or inferible evidence may not produce conviction under a criminal indictment, it suffices to bring to light the truth under historical investigation. For this purpose it behoves me to develop to Irishmen as well as Englishmen the doctrines and character of the *truly Catholic and learned Richerius*, and some of the *first-rate French Catholic theologians*, whose opinions have been so earnestly resorted to by these two inflex-

ible professors of the most refined orthodoxy. Edmund Richer was a man of great learning and impetuosity: in the turbulent times of the League in France, he went the length of extolling the act of Jacques Clement, the fanatical Dominican Friar, who assassinated Henry III. in a public thesis, the very year after he had taken the decree of D. D. A. D. 1591. He forcibly maintained the true (whig) principles of civil power, little congenial with the courtly doctrines of an absolute monarchy, but engrafted upon them all the Puritan pruriency and excess in their application, which brought King Charles to the block. — Cardinal du Perron, in a letter to Casaubon, quotes the words of the original thesis, which he had in his possession. “Henry III. who had forfeited his word with the States, was justly”
 “put to death as a tyrant, and all, who resemble him ought not
 “only to be pursued by armed resistance, but by private as-
 “sassination, and that Jacques Clement, who killed him, had
 “been inspired by no other passion, than zeal for church dis-
 “cipline and love of the laws, his country, and public liberty,
 “of which he was the avenger and protector.”

Not only did Richer err in misapplying and abusing true principles of civil government, but he wandered further and more grossly from the truth, by assuming the same principles and applying them to spiritual power. He certainly said very truly, but in very bad Latin: “Jure divino et naturali, omni-
 “bus perfectis Communitatibus et civili societate prius, imme-
 “diatus atque essentialius competit, ut seipsam gubernet,
 “quam alicui homini singulari aut totam societatem et Com-
 “munitatem regat. Neque spatia temporum, neque privi-
 “legia locorum, neque dignitates personarum unquam prescri-
 “bere poterunt.” (De Eccl. Pot. c. 1 & c. 6.) I give the passage in the original language, and offer under correction my own understanding of the text. Perhaps the *Richerian* Dr. Charles O’Conor may give his countrymen a version more congenial with the lubricous sense and fugitive import of the words of the *Calvino-Jansenistical* author. After all communities and civil society had been once perfected by the law of God and

Nature, it was more immediately and essentially competent for them to govern themselves and the whole society and community, than for any particular individual to do so: against which no lapse of time, no local privilege, nor personal dignity can prescribe. In propounding and applying these principles of political government to the kingdom of Christ or Church government he grossly, and I fear (like too many of his followers in letters, blue books and addresses to Ireland) maliciously attempted to transfer the appointment of church governors from the Vicar of Christ to the Civil Magistrate. He adopted all the principles and doctrines of the recreant and schismatical Arch-bishop of Spalatro, who came over to England in 1616 to flatter and bamboozle our pedantic James, by whom, (though a foreigner) he was promoted to several church livings; and to publish with security Francis Paoli's history of the Council of Trent, as he did in London, 1619, under the anagrammatical disguise of *Pierre Suave Polano*, for *Paul Sarpi de Venise*. A full account of his doctrines and their refutation may be seen in my *Church and State*. (p. 189, 190) Gregory XV. who had been his early friend and school-fellow, prevailed upon him to return to his See and to his duty. He mounted a pulpit in London, and openly retracted every thing he had said or published against the holy See. This so much irritated James, that he deprived him of all his ecclesiastical livings, and ordered him out of the kingdom in three days. His versatility and insincerity were such, that in the year 1623, in which his friend died, he wrote to England, within nine months after he left it, that he retracted his retractation. Some of his letters were intercepted, and after the death of his school-fellow, he was confined by his successor, Urban the VIII. in the castle of St. Angelo, and there he died in 1625.—Richer, the follower of his schismatical doctrines, ineptly applied his political principles of government to the church of God: whereas Bossuet's address to the Catholic church (he really was a *truly catholic and learned* man) rightly informed him and the rest of his insidiously malicious and mis-

chievous school of the difference. *Ye are a people, a state, a society: but Jesus Christ, who is your king, holds nothing from you: his authority is of a higher origin. You have no greater right to say, who shall be his ministers, than you have to appoint him to be your sovereign.* (Vid. the application of this whole passage in a note History of Ireland since union. 3 Vol. p. 683) On the 13th of March, 1612, the provincial Synod of Sens, composed of the Cardinal du Perron, Archbishop of Sens, and the Bishops of Paris, Auxere, Meaux, Orleans, Troyes, Nevers, and Chartres condemned at Paris Richer's treaty of *ecclesiastical and political power, as containing many propositions, expositions and allegations, false, erroneous, scandalous and sounding schismatical and heretical.* The Bishop of Paris, on the 16th of the same month, published a pastoral, by which he ordered, that this censure should be read after the prones (or homilies) in every parish: the same treaty was condemned on the 24th of May by the Arch-bishop of Aix, and the Bishops of Riez, Frejus and Sisteron, his Suffragans: and afterwards was condemned at Rome. He was removed from his office, and lived in disgrace and retirement till the 29th of November, 1631: he is reported to have given into his bishop a full written retractation of his errors about eighteen months before his death. After he was dead, the party, always enthusiastically jealous of the inflexibility of their leaders, gave out a tale, vouched for by no living witness, disguised by gross anachronism, and improbable to have happened without producing a universal and alarming outcry in those days of party violence, namely, that he was invited to dinner by the famous *Pere Joseph* the Capucin, the confidant and active favourite of Cardinal Richlieu, where four armed ruffians started from behind the arras, and with poignards at his throat, obliged him to sign the retractations; and that he died two days after of fear, chagrin and humiliation. The truth or falsity of the incident rendered his doctrine neither more nor less Catholic. I cannot help remarking, that I find no mention made of any of

the second order of the clergy having assisted at the Synod or Council of Sens: and that the sentence of the Prelates only is recorded. I have been induced to offer this observation to my reader, because Dr. O'Connor has gone the length of making a very deceptive and insidious assertion, (3 Col. 22) that "Priests have *jure divino* a right to teach christianity; that they are bound to denounce heretical doctrines, and to discuss doctrines of faith and rules of discipline *in Synods*, in which *their attendance* is always necessary, whilst that of the *Bishop* is not." The revival, or rather vivification of *Richerism* at the commencement of the French revolution, not only helped to put down the French monarchy, but immediately produced the *civil* constitution of the French clergy, of which so much has been before said, and which has been so tenderly spoken of, so fondly cherished, so artfully countenanced by all the modern *Richerian* advocates for national churches under the influence, controul and restraint of the law. It was not without reflection, that I observed, that the Jansenists might not be improperly called the *Puritans* of the Roman Catholic Church.—*Richerism* is the monstrous offspring of their secret intrigues and *antipapal furor*. The fanatical priest *Ame du Bourg*, who was executed in 1559, under Henry II. for an infuriate and treasonable speech in parliament, in favor of the Calvinists, and for violently supporting their doctrines, under grievous suspicion of having been implicated in the assassination of the President, MENARD, one of his judges, not only held the doctrines, which RICHER afterwards took up and supported as to civil government, but he signed the following *formula* of his religious creed. "I believe the power of absolving and retaining, commonly called *the Keys of the Church*, to have been given by God, not to one man or to two, but to the whole church, that is, to all the faithful and those believing in Jesus Christ." Such precisely is the doctrine of *Richer* and of *Quesnel* the Pope of the Jansenists: upon the condemnation of whose creed, by the See of Rome, Columbanus dis-

cants with such mysterious sympathy (4 Col. 21) I should not have said so much of the *truly catholic Richer*, had I not felt it a duty to arrest the attention of the governors of such parts of the catholic church, as are within the dominions of His Majesty, and of such of His Majesty's servants, as are or may be entrusted with the reins of government, to the origin, nature, adoption, countenance, extension, use, abuse, advantage, mischief, danger, excesses, and fatal results of *Richerism*. I give them both an awful warning, in the execution of their respective charges, to keep a watchful eye, and a well nerved arm upon each of the *Richerian* School, who have insidiously attempted to introduce any of the peculiar maxims, doctrines and practices of their truly catholic master into the British empire, whether as remonstrants in the 17th century, as *protesting catholic dissenters* in the 18th, or in the 19th as *jure divino* presbyters, as governors and teachers of a national church, as importers of a *civil constitution* for the English and Irish catholic clergy, as manufacturers of home-made Bishops, as reforming disciplinarians, as *Vetoists*, as *Columbanians*, or under whatever guise, form, or appellation a *Richerist* may be distinguished.

I should fall short of my duty to the public, were I not to draw the attention of my readers to the characters, doctrines and conduct of some of the more prominent of the *first-rate French Catholic theologians*, upon whose authority the reverend and most learned reformer attempts to recommend his errors and falsehoods to his countrymen. DUPIN, whom he quotes more frequently than any other, was certainly a man of learning: he was a professed *Richerian*, and openly preached his errors, even after *Richer* had solemnly abjured them. The learned and inflexibly orthodox Bossuet, finding his writings unsound and dangerous, prevailed on the great Harlay, Archbishop of Paris, to condemn them. For his doctrines and conduct he was deprived of his Chair in the Sorbonne, and banished to Châtelleraut in 1703. He also publicly (perhaps

not *sincerely*) retracted. He was allowed to return to Paris, though he never re-obtained his Chair in the University.—Clement XI. thanked Louis XIV. for having chastised him, and in the brief, which he addressed to the King on that occasion, he calls Doctor Dupin *a man of very unsound doctrine, and guilty of many outrages upon the Holy Sec.*—He was for a long time in close correspondence with Wake, Arch-Bishop of Canterbury. He (like some other modern Richerists) affected great anxiety for, and facility in coalescing with the *national* established church of England. Upon suspicions of his insincerity and irregularity of conduct, he was further proceeded against and his papers were seized on the 10th February, 1719, amongst which Lafitau, Bishop of Sisteron, who was present when they were brought into the *Palais Royal*, read one, which expressly maintained, “that our principles of
“faith might very well accord with those of the church of
“England. It maintained, that without altering the integrity
“of our dogma, they might abolish auricular confession, and
“speak no more of transubstantiation in the sacrament of the
“Eucharist, abolish religious vows, knock off fasts, abstinence and lent, dispense with the Pope, and permit priests to
“marry.” After his death a woman claimed, as his widow, her legal rights in his property. It is not irrelevant here to observe, that Lafitau, who wrote the *History of the Constitution Unigenitus*, remarked, “that *Quesnelism* is, at bottom, real
“Calvinism, which not daring to shew itself openly in France,
“concealed itself under the errors of the times. This is what
“was seen in the famous projects, which the *Quesnelists* had
“for uniting the Gallican Church, with the established Church
“of England.” He further says upon putting some very natural results from their sympathies; “It is unquestionable, that
“we should then see the *Quesnelists* openly coalesce with the
“Protestants, in order no longer to make separate bodies, as
“they now make but one soul with them.” See the confirmation of this judgment of *Lafitau* confirmed by that of *Edmund*

Burke with reference to the *Protesting Catholic Dissenters*.
History of Ireland from it's Union, 3 Vol. 790.

LAUNOIS is another of Doctor O'Connor's great French theologians, and a man certainly he was of great erudition: was in high estimation with the Jansenistical party: he held for a considerable time *Monday* conferences at his own house, which were eagerly resorted to by the party; the general topic was defence of *Richerism*: they were stopped by an order of the King in 1636. From his zeal for depurating religion, by striking off non-essentials, he was called *Le Denicheur des Saints*, Uncanonizer of Saints. He rather chose to be expelled the Sorbonne, than sign the censure of Arnauld, condemned by Rome and the Gallican Church. He went further, by publickly writing against the formula of the assembly of the clergy, in 1656. That general assembly of the clergy of France, or national Synod, consisted of 17 Arch-Bishops, 37 Bishops and 27 Deputies of the second order; and they examined, reviewed and approved of whatever had been done up to that time, against Jansenism.

As it is probable, that the five *Epistolæ Columbani ad Hybernios*, and particularly the last, which has swelled beyond the size and cost of a pamphlet, and this letter may not fall under the same eyes, I early claim thanks of the most learned Doctor, for contributing my insignificant mite towards the more general circulation of that extraordinary effort of Genius, *non imitabile fulmen*, by which he has blasted his opponents, damned and anathematized every word of their books, taught wretched mortals how to disarm the anger of the Gods, and placed himself over the pigmy crew of his assailants in the menacing attitude of *Jupiter tonans*. He stamped the boards of the Vatican, and all Olympus trembled at his nod. (5 Col. 197) *Quos ego*. As this will be my last quotation on this subject, the reader must not be too abruptly surprized. Let him be gradually prepared for the blast and explosion.

Some eminent painters have indulged their thirst after posthumous renown by introducing their own portraits into conspi-

cuous characters in their most celebrated pieces. Columbanus appears so fond of his own features, that he has scarcely turned out of his hands a single picture, or even a study, in which they are not to be most distinctly recognized. I have already applied to him what Flaccus said of that Sardinian exotic Tigellius: "*Nothing was ever like that man: and nothing was ever so unlike to himself.*" As, however, Columbanus lays in high *pretensions to a name and reputation in life*, by Tully's rules of history, it becomes my duty to explain the *general conduct and character*, which he has assumed, and by which, therefore, cotemporary and future generations must judge of him. The part, which he has undertaken or submitted to play in this tragi-comic farce, was cast for and by himself; and we are to examine how he performs it. The character is as new as Caliban's, in Shakespear's *Tempest*.

Si quid inexpertum scenæ committis, et audes

Personam formare novam: servetur ad imum

Qualis ab incepto processerit: et sibi constet. Hor. Art of Poetry

If on the boards a character you place

Newform'd, and to your auditors unknown,

Beware, that from his entrance, none do trace

A line, a trait, a feature, but his own.

He is classical to the back-bone: he keeps his manuscript beyond the probationary tenth year *nonumque prematur in unum*. He plunges with the patriotism of a *Curtius* into the poddle: mindful of the Roman caution

Delere licebit

Quod non edideris: nescit vox missa reverti.

You may correct, what in your closet lies.

If published, it irrevocably flies. Fras. Hor. Art of Poetry.

Once his literary *æstrum* had driven him before the public, his progress into towering consequence was rapid as the bolt of Jove. On St. Patrick's day 1810 he replaces the washed off rouge, mounts the strolling cart of Thespis under a borrowed name, and modestly disclaims all *refinements of language or elegances of stile*. (Advertisement to Columbanus—the play-bill

for the benefit of the author, being his first public appearance as a performer.)

Ignotum tragicæ genus invenisse camænæ
Dicitur, et plaustri vexisse poemata Thespis,
Qui canerent, agerentque peruncti fœcibus ora.

Thespis, inventor of the tragic art,
Carried his vagrant players in a cart:
High o'er the crowd the mimic tribe appear'd,
And play'd and sung with lees of wine besmeared. F.H. A.P.

Exalted merit soon spurned disguise: the wonder of the gaping crowd unveiled the mystery in 1810: (3 Col. 3) "I am the
"author of the letter signed *Columbanus*, addressed to the
"people of Ireland." But on the return of St. Patrick's
day 1812, a stage is erected under a licenced patronage, and
with a dedication to the great Mæcenæ. Æschylus displays his
powers, pomp and greatness on the boards.

Post hunc personæ pallæque repertor honestæ
Æschylus, et modicis instravit pulpita tignis,
Et docuit magnumque loqui, nitique cothurno.

Then Æschylus a decent vizard us'd;
Built a low stage; the flowing robe diffused;
In language more sublime his actors rage,
And in the graceful buskin tread the stage. Fras. Hor. A. P.

(5 Col. 6.) "Some slanderous pamphlets, disgraceful to the
"literature and to the manners of our country, have appeared
"in reply to *Columbanus*." (8) "However repugnant these
"pretensions may be to the doctrine of St. Paul, *let your obe-*
"*dience be rational*; yet could I make allowances for the
"waywardness of the human will, which always tends to despo-
"tism, and even for these strange publications, if I could dis-
"cover in them any one quality, which might render them pa-
"latable to a *classical taste*. Sometimes even the most im-
"pious doctrines come recommended by perspicuity: if the
"maxims are profligate, yet the language is terse: lack of
"learning may be supplied by a selection of the choicest words;
"by splendor of imagery: by vivacity and playfulness of wit!!!

“ But in these publications, each sluggish line draggles (a dip
 “ from the common place-book) like a cart horse carrying lum-
 “ ber after his leader, with a stupid monotony of nonsense,
 “ vulgarity of epithet, and coarseness of calumny, which ex-
 “ poses their writers to derision, and their abettors to disgrace!
 “ Here is neither *theology* nor *history*. *Assertion after asser-*
 “ *tion*, followed here and there by a miserable *non sequitur*,
 “ seems to stare like an idiot, at that strange thing, which pre-
 “ cedes, and that stranger thing, which follows it: and feeling
 “ itself out of place, and out of time, shivering with cold,
 “ starved with hunger, pinched with poverty, conscious of weak-
 “ ness, and looking round to every contiguous word for a por-
 “ tion of life, it seems with a beggarly tone to petition for a
 “ pittance of animation to save it from despair. (*Bravissimo!*)
 “ *Columbanus* would honestly acknowledge *superiority*, if
 “ not of truth or argument, at least of brilliancy and vigour,
 “ if he saw even the sophistry of his countryman *Celestius*: if
 “ he could find falsehood screened by eloquence, or ignorance
 “ by style. Splendor of diction and fertility of fancy cover a
 “ multitude of sins. (Symptoms of *Columbanian* features.)
 “ But here is falsehood in all its deformity.—In these effusions
 “ of dulness, and inventions of malignity, we find neither har-
 “ mony of cadence, nor vigour of construction, neither truth
 “ in the premises, nor accuracy in the conclusions. However
 “ Irishmen may be accused of blundering in conversation—
 “ surely we are not *such diggers of our own graves*, as to truc-
 “ kle to such blundering as this.

“ Is *Columbanus* practised in the *Mac-sycophant* art of *booing*
 “ and *booing* to such stupidity of intellect? such starvation of
 “ mind? He hopes not.—He will not *affect* modesty, where he
 “ is conscious of superior vigour: nor does he apprehend, that
 “ he can, in the eyes of any rational observer, be liable to the
 “ imputation of self-conceit, if arguing from the incoherent and
 “ insipid effusions of indigested malignity, which disgrace the
 “ sickly pages of Castabala, he dares to assert, that having only

“such feeble opponents to encounter, he can walk at his leisure
“and even loiture over the course.”

(121) “In vain does he hope, that Columbanus may be
“taught by falsehood, or provoked by insolence to descend
“from that superiority, which historical truth and manly argu-
“ment have conferred into a contemptible warfare of persona-
“lity. No.—Columbanus will not brawl with defeated spleen,
“nor will he hurl back the revilings of disgraced ignorance.—
“Imputations of heresy, and excommunications of malice are
“cheap commodities, in which it is beneath the dignity of a
“Columbanus to contend: Nor ought the tongue, which has
“been consecrated to piety, to be profaned by slander, or the
“life, which has been dedicated to religion, to be contaminated
“by malice.”

(Ib. 10.) “No—He will not disguise or disgrace his real
“character by any fictitious appearance of humility. Every
“*hypocritical* cry of religion in danger, every *fraudulent* cla-
“mour of schism and *heresy*, every attempt to abuse the piety
“of the people, and to take advantage of their ignorance,
“Columbanus’ heart swells with the generous eagerness of his
“ancestors to oppose: and his pen is determined, in defiance
“of all calumny, to detect.” *Quos ego—*

No. IV.

Proofs of the Truth and Applicability of what is asserted in
the following Passage of the Note concerning Columbanus.
Hist. of Ireland since the Union, 3 vol. p. 820.

“His charge of the author being misguided by *foreign in-*
“*fluence men*, he can no otherwise understand, than that in
“1791, when the *Protesting Catholic Dissenters* broached
“certain doctrines, which the Author conceived bore too hard
“upon the spiritual supremacy of the head of the Christian
“hierarchy, he wrote the *Case Stated*, which oppugned them.
“Sir Richard Musgrave is the only person the Author is aware

“ of, that has noticed in print that publication. As, however,
 “ Columbanus’s first letter is made up of the general substance
 “ and matter contained in and compiled by Mr. Butler for the
 “ famous blue books, published at that time against the powers
 “ and jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome, it would be folly
 “ to deny, that they were *duo laborantes in unum*: and if the
 “ author could have foreseen in 1805 these sympathetic ener-
 “ gies of the Rev. Doctor with Lord Sidmouth’s tool, he too
 “ should have had a hand in instigating *Cerberus* to bark at
 “ Erin and her religion, in the frontispiece of the author’s his-
 “ torical letter to Sir Richard Musgrave.”

The courteous reader is respectfully reminded, that what was published by me twenty years ago, could have had no personal allusion to *Columbanus*, whom I then had never heard of, nor to any thing, that he has published within these two last years: but it is earnestly requested, that the full and fair bearings of the extracts from my *Case Stated*, which was written in answer to the blue books in 1791, may, by transposition, be applied to *Columbanus*’ five addresses, published in 1810, 1811 and 1812, as conclusive evidence, that their respective authors were *duo laborantes in unum*. Q. E. D. It formerly was a maxim of the schools. *Quæ sunt eaden uni tertio, sunt eadem inter se*. In application of this maxim, which I hope is not extinguished by the *new lights*, I humbly beg leave to remit my reader’s reminiscences to the whole, but more particularly to the latter part of the preceding number of this Appendix.

Having in my last history explicitly avowed, that the object of my *Case Stated* was to make head against doctrines, which bore too hard upon the supremacy of the head of the Christian hierarchy, I do not reject the claim, which those, who join with *Columbanus* in charging me with making assertions, without proofs, have to call upon me for evidence, that the author of the blue books and *Columbanus* were *duo laborantes in unum*. I wrote against the two first blue books in 1791 to unmask a battery, from which a very destructive fire was kept up against the prerogatives, commissions and supremacy of the holy See. In 1812 I have to repel the atrocious open charges of a despe-

rado, who (*ore vomens ignes*) disgorges his random fire at every person and every object, through and by which he can annoy, wound or demolish the chair of Peter. Whoever will impartially peruse the three blue books, two of which were published in 1791 and the third in 1792, and compare them closely with the five addresses of Columbanus, will be at no loss to discover the main spring, from which both streams take their source. They may readily trace their windings, their occasional dips under ground, their whimsical re-appearances, their smooth rippling through flowery meads, their romantic falls from rocks and mountains, their settlement into quiet and expansive lakes, their gradual confluence, their angry swell into torrents, that foam and rage and bear havock and destruction in their boisterous course. It would insult a reader to attempt to conduct him through this watery labyrinth along all the ramified streams, which have worked their channels through the interminable tracks of the spiritual kingdom. Suffice it for me in 1812 to offer in reply to Columbanus, what I said in 1791, upon a Test trap and mock docility to spiritual power.

“ It is the duty of an historian to represent the persons,
 “ whose actions he relates, as truly and faithfully as the actions
 “ themselves. By far the greatest number of the English
 “ Roman Catholics of rank and fortune have, throughout the
 “ whole of the business, sided with the committee; though
 “ some of that description have, from the beginning, disallowed
 “ their commission, others have remained totally inactive; and
 “ some few have, latterly, appeared in open opposition to
 “ their measures. On the other side, the four apostolical
 “ vicars, by far the greatest number of the Roman Catholic
 “ clergy, some persons of rank and fortune, and by far the
 “ greatest number of the middling and lower classes of Roman
 “ Catholics, have been driven to the mortifying necessity of
 “ publicly opposing the measures of the committee; and their
 “ opposition, thanks (under God) to the liberality and wisdom
 “ of parliament, has been crowned with the most signal success.”

Vid. Ca. St. p. 57.

“ The first act, which brings us into public, is the protesta-
 “ tion; which, as the gentlemen of the committee say with
 “ truth, *was signed by all the apostolic vicars* and their co-*
 “ *adjutors, and, with few exceptions, indeed, by all the clergy,*
 “ *and by all the laity of any consequence in the kingdom of*
 “ *England.* And they further tell us, that *the signing of the*
 “ *protestation was attended with the most salutary effects;*
 “ *prejudices against us rapidly subsided, and, as men and*
 “ *citizens, we found ourselves beginning to be restored to the*
 “ *confidence and affections of the public.*”—*Vid. Ca. St. 58, 59.*

The protestation, or formal disavowal of many noxious opinions imputed to Roman Catholics, signed by 1523 persons of rank, fortune and respectability, is said to be deposited in the *British Museum*. It will be useless, therefore, to trouble the reader with a copy of more of it, than what immediately relates to the oath, into which the committee contended the substance of the protestation was compressed. This I call a *test trap*, because it was a manœuvre to entrap the body of the Catholics in an unintended disclaimer of some of the highest jurisdictional prerogatives of Christ's Vicar upon earth: to illaquate them by a subscription to a formula at variance with their practical submission to the authority of a living judge of controversy in the church. When the writer for the committee had moulded the protestation into the form of an oath, the four Catholic English prelates having been first apprized of it by the open channel of the newspapers, met in synod, considered the tenor of it, and published the following

“ ENCYCLICAL LETTER,

“ *Addressed to all the Faithful, both Clergy and Laity, in*
 “ *the Four Districts of England, by the Four Vicars*
 “ *Apostolic, Charles Ramaten, James Birthan, Thomas*
 “ *Acon, and Matthew Comanen.*

* 2d Blue Book, p. 3. It is requisite here to mention, that the gentlemen of the committee published, at different times, two Blue Books, as justificative pieces of their own conduct, and circulated them gratis throughout the nation.

" Dearly beloved Brethren, and Children of Christ,

" WE think it necessary to notify to you, that, having held
 " a meeting, on the 19th of October 1789, after mature deli-
 " beration and previous discussion, we unanimously condemned
 " the new form of an oath, intended for the Catholics, pub-
 " lished in Woodfall's Register, June 26th, 1789, and declared
 " it unlawful to be taken. We also declared, that none of
 " the faithful, clergy, or laity, under our care, ought to take
 " any new oath, or sign any new declaration in doctrinal
 " matters, or subscribe any new instrument, wherein the inte-
 " rests of religion are concerned, without the previous appro-
 " bation of their respective bishops.

" These determinations we judged necessary, to the promo-
 " ting of your spiritual welfare, to fix an anchor for you to
 " hold to, and to restore peace to your minds. To these de-
 " terminations, therefore, we require your submission.

+ CHARLES RAMATEN, V. A.

+ JAMES BIRTHAN, V. A.

Hammersmith,

+ THOMAS ACON, V. A.

October 21, 1789.

+ MATTHEW COMANEN, V. A.

" *Such is the public instrument, by which the four aposto-
 " lical vicars, who are the guardians and protectors of the Ro-
 " man Catholic religion in England, and whom the body ac-
 " knowledge as their lawful bishops, condemned this oath, after
 " they had themselves signed the protestation.

" The Committee inform us† the protestation was received
 " by a Member of the Committee in the month of November,
 " 1788; the rank and situation of the person, who proposed it,
 " and several other circumstances, made it absolutely necessary
 " for them to enquire, whether the Catholics would or would
 " not sign it. The Member of the Committee, who received it,
 " transmitted it immediately to the secretary of the Committee,
 " with directions to forward it immediately to the vicars apo-
 " stolic, and request their opinion of the lawfulness of signing it."

* Ca. Stat. 102.

† Second Blue Book, p. 2.

“ This was done; and they elsewhere acknowledge, ‘ * We
 “ never assumed to approve or disapprove of it, as far as it re-
 “ lated to doctrines. On receipt of the protestation, we trans-
 “ mitted it to the apostolic vicars, and till they had not only
 “ approved of it, but themselves signed it, or declared they
 “ should give no opposition to the signing of it by the faithful
 “ of their respective districts, we neither signed it ourselves,
 “ nor proposed it to be signed by others.

“ And for this docile and submissive deference to their spi-
 “ ritual superiors, on this occasion the Committee are not back-
 “ ward in assuming to themselves a decent share of merit.—
 “ † What more than this could have been expected from the
 “ most docile members of Christ’s Church? When, however,
 “ this same matter *relating to Doctrines*, was to be reduced
 “ into the form of an oath, I believe every individual in this
 “ nation (if we except the Gentlemen of the Committee, and
 “ their devoted adherents) will admit without hesitation, that
 “ in this latter form, it came more immediately under the pro-
 “ vince of the bishops to examine, than it was in the former
 “ shape of a declaration or protestation. The Committee,
 “ however, with their usual consistency, *not having assumed*
 “ *to approve or disapprove of the protestation, as far as it*
 “ *related to Doctrines*, now, without any communication with
 “ their spiritual superiors, much less with their sanction or
 “ approbation, undertake either to frame or to admit a form
 “ of oath framed by others, as the future test of the religious
 “ faith of all the English Roman Catholic subjects of his Ma-
 “ jesty: and this form of oath, so either framed or admitted
 “ ‡ *by their direction, was inserted at full length with the bill*
 “ *in Woodfall’s Register, June 26th, 1789.*

“ It cannot surely but appear singular, that this new form
 “ of oath *relating to Doctrines*, should have been first commu-
 “ nicated to the Apostolical Vicars, through the medium of a

* Second Blue Book, p. 3.

† Second Blue Book, p. 5.

‡ Reeve, ubi supra.

“ public newspaper, by the very gentlemen, who so pompously
 “ *boast of the extreme deference and attention, which, through-*
 “ *out the whole course of this business, they have paid to the*
 “ *Apostolical Vicars,*” I appeal to all persons, whose minds could
 “ not have been biassed by taking a side in this dispute, whe-
 “ ther or no this conduct of the Committee did or did not war-
 “ rant the conclusion made by the Bishops, that the Committee
 “ intended no longer to apply to them for their opinion upon
 “ the validity of the oath. For they had thus ushered into
 “ public an oath, and the heads of a bill, of which they them-
 “ selves speak in this manner; * ‘ Upon this the oath was ta-
 “ ken out of our hands. It was then the property of govern-
 “ ment. It was in their possession, and we could not alter it.
 “ Not one letter was at our command. Every alteration in the
 “ oath, we knew would retard, and might endanger the pro-
 “ gress of the bill.’ It was, therefore, to be presumed and
 “ concluded, that, as the Committee express themselves, *here*
 “ *then for the moment, was the ultimatum of Government,*
 “ whatever relief or redress the body of English Roman Catho-
 “ lies were to expect, was only to be received upon the previ-
 “ ous condition of their taking an oath, which their ecclesiastical
 “ superiors, ‘ after mature deliberation, and previous discussi-
 “ ons, unanimously condemn, and declare to be unlawful to be
 “ taken.’ The Committee’s own champion, very candidly
 “ avows, what all other impartial persons will readily admit,
 “ that ‘ they acted, however, within their sphere, and moved
 “ most certainly within the circle of their pastoral charge, for
 “ the direction and safety of their flocks. For they are the
 “ lawful judges and arbitrators of all religious matters apper-
 “ taining to doctrine and morals. In this light every public
 “ oath is to be considered, where doctrines are to be disclaimed.’
 “ Now it is very evident, that the bishops were officially
 “ bound to declare to their flocks, that they were of opinion,
 “ that the oath could not be lawfully taken. *The pilot, who sees*
 “ *the vessel in danger of splitting against a rock concealed*

* Second Blue Book, p. 3.

“ *under the waves, and neglects to give warning, betrays his*
 “ *trust,* said the late bishop of the Northern district. Nay,
 “ the very committee themselves, who inveigh so passionately
 “ against the bishops for having passed this public censure,
 “ have expressly **lamented their misfortune in having incurred*
 “ *the disapprobation of them, who, from their station in this*
 “ *country, are the natural guardians of the Catholic religion†.*”

“ It is not my intention to revive the controversy of the ad-
 “ missibility of the foregoing form of the oath. But in justice
 “ to those, who had signed the protestation, and refused to
 “ take the oath, which the gentlemen of the committee call
 “ *one and the same instrument,* I think myself warranted in
 “ calling the attention of my readers to one most essential va-
 “ riation in the oath, from the tendency, sense and words of
 “ the protestation. Without comment, I appeal to every im-
 “ partial reader, whether by this abstract proposition, *I ac-*
 “ *knowledge no infallibility in the Pope,* which is contained
 “ in the oath, the full and just meaning and sense is expressed
 “ by the following part of the protestation.

“ II. ‘ We have also been accused of holding as a principle
 “ of our religion, that implicit obedience is due from us to the
 “ orders and decrees of Popes and general councils; and that,
 “ therefore, if the Pope, or any general council should, for
 “ the good of the church, command us to take up arms against
 “ government, or by any means to subvert the laws and li-
 “ berties of this country, or to exterminate persons of a dif-
 “ ferent persuasion from us, we (it is asserted by our accusers)
 “ hold ourselves bound to obey such orders or decrees on pain
 “ of eternal fire.

“ Whereas we positively deny, that we owe any such obe-
 “ dience to the Pope and general council, or to either of them:
 “ and we believe, that no act, that is in itself immoral or dis-
 “ honest can ever be justified by, or under colour, that it is

* First Blue Book, p. 12.

† Ca. St. 103 to 109.

“ done, either for the good of the church, or in obedience to
 “ any ecclesiastical power whatever. We acknowledge no in-
 “ fallibility in the Pope; and we neither apprehend nor be-
 “ lieve, that our disobedience to any such orders or decrees
 “ (should any such be given or made) could subject us to any
 “ punishment whatever. And we hold and insist, that the Ca-
 “ tholic Church has no power that can, directly or indirectly,
 “ prejudice the rights of Protestants, inasmuch as it is strictly
 “ confined to the refusing to them a participation in her sa-
 “ craments, and other religious privileges of her communion;
 “ which no church (as we conceive) can be expected to give to
 “ these out of her pale, and which no person out of her pale
 “ will, we suppose, ever require.’

“ In that sense, which alone the context of the protestation
 “ warrants, every Roman Catholic would be ready to declare
 “ against the infallibility of such decrees of Popes and councils
 “ as are there mentioned; and that, therefore, no obedience is
 “ due to them. In this, as in the obvious sense of the pro-
 “ testation, did I sign it; and am ready to repeat my signature.
 “ For it is evident by the protestation, that we mean, and in-
 “ tend, to deny or repel the charge of paying implicit obedi-
 “ ence to the decrees of Popes and general councils, even in
 “ what is sinful and wicked, because we deem them infallible;
 “ that is, because we think that their having decreed the thing
 “ makes it cease to be sinful or wicked. This I submit to my
 “ readers, is the real, and, in fact, the only sense of the pro-
 “ testation. I certainly shall not be judged rash or presumptu-
 “ ously didactic in making this assertion: for the Rev. Mr.
 “ Reeve, who appears to be the avowed champion of the com-
 “ mittee, in the work, which he wrote in defence of the oath,
 “ most unanswerably proves this to be the sense of the protest-
 “ ation*.

* A view of the oath intended by the Legislature to the Roman Ca-
 tholics of England, pag. 45, 46, 47. As this author tells us in his preface,
 that he has read most of the correspondence and original papers he treats of;

“ The adversaries of the Roman Catholic Creed have been so
 “ much in the habit of magnifying and misconstruing doctrines
 “ to our prejudice, that the most harmless points of theory have
 “ been frequently transformed by their excessive fears into
 “ frightful monsters. Even the Pope’s infallibility has been
 “ echoed through the land, and by some magic sound, as it
 “ were, has been called forth like a horrid spectre to spread
 “ terror amongst the deluded multitude. But the figure is ex-
 “ hibited in such exotic colours, and distorted in so strange a
 “ manner, that it bears no resemblance with any thing ever
 “ known to Catholics by the name of infallibility. To justify
 “ the assertion, we need but present it in the shape, in which
 “ it has been drawn by a Protestant pen, and offered to us in
 “ the public protestation we signed. The Pope’s infallibility is
 “ there introduced under the notion, that we believe the Pope
 “ can do or command nothing wrong ; and that, by the prin-
 “ ciples of our religion, we therefore hold implicit obedience,
 “ as it is pretended, to be due from us to all orders of the
 “ Pope, whatever they may be. Consequently if the Pope
 “ should command us, for the good of the Church, to take
 “ up arms against Government, or by any means to subvert
 “ the laws and liberties of this country, or to exterminate per-
 “ sons differing from us in religious tenets, we should hold
 “ ourselves bound, as our accusers say, to obey such orders,
 “ on pain of eternal fire.

“ Such is the description given by Protestants of the Pope’s
 “ infallibility, and such is the precise object, which, under
 “ that appellation, we are called upon to disclaim. Such is
 “ the doctrine, which we are supposed to hold of that dreaded
 “ phantom, a doctrine pregnant with endless mischief to the
 “ state, if we really held it. Under this notion it is classed

and that these are the vouchers he has ready to produce in support of the facts he mentions ; we conclude from the admission to the use and the command of the production of these vouchers, the author to be either the friend, advocate, or servant of the Committee and that the work was written and published with their privity, consent, and approbation.

“ by the act with other pernicious doctrines, and under this
 “ notion it is rejected by us. *Under this notion* we sincerely
 “ declare, that we acknowledge in the Pope no infallibility
 “ whatever. In his words, in his actions, in his writings, in
 “ his mandates, in his public and private transactions with men
 “ we believe him fallible, and like other princes liable to pas-
 “ sion, to error, and mistake. Catholics are not such ideots,
 “ as to think any man whatever impeccable on earth, nor yet
 “ such bigots as to fancy, that an order from the Pope to do
 “ an immoral or dishonest action, can be binding in any case
 “ whatever, not even under the colour of its being done for
 “ the good of the church. Far from obeying, in that case,
 “ they would think themselves bound to resist the order, nor
 “ do they apprehend, that their resistance could subject them
 “ to any punishment whatever. Here ends the political point
 “ of view, the sole view and object of the oath in all its parts.

“ The Pope’s infallibility, as it is usually understood by
 “ Catholic Divines, is solely confined to the dogmatical deci-
 “ sions he may fix upon a controverted point of doctrine ca-
 “ nonically brought before him to be determined, when, after
 “ due examination and discussion with his divines and private
 “ council, the Pope speaks *ex cathedrâ*, as it is termed, to the
 “ whole church, as supreme pastor thereof, and dogmatically
 “ decides the point in dispute. Whether his decision, accom-
 “ panied with all these circumstances, be then final, is the
 “ question. It is a question, in which none but schoolmen
 “ ever engage, it being no where treated of, but in the tracts
 “ of speculative theology, and seldom heard of beyond the
 “ precincts of the school: a question wholly harmless, because
 “ purely speculative and *unconnected with every social and*
 “ *moral duty* of a Christian. Its affirmative or its negative
 “ may be held with equal safety to the state. Few there are,
 “ it seems, who ever form a decided opinion upon it. In this
 “ theological sense it can be no object of terror to any one,
 “ because in this sense it has no pernicious tendency to hurt or

“disturb the state. It is no article of Catholic belief. It may
 “now be asked, whether as a Catholic I may lawfully swear,
 “that in the Pope I acknowledge no infallibility whatever?
 “Why not? For as Protestants understand it, as mentioned
 “in the protestation, infallibility is a pernicious doctrine, and
 “as explained by our divines, it makes no article of Catholic
 “belief.” (So far Reeve the Committee’s own author.)

“What can be more explicit, and at the same time more true,
 “than that *infallibility as mentioned in the protestation, is a*
 “*pernicious doctrine?* And as such, no Roman Catholic will
 “object to renounce it; and they did in fact so renounce it by
 “signing the protestation. Now, as the gentlemen of the com-
 “mittee profess, that the oath is but a repetition of the protes-
 “tation, and *consequently forms one and the same instrument,*
 “we must again attend to their explanation of the sense, mean-
 “ing and tendency of the word *infallibility*, as used in the oath.
 “*As to acknowledging no infallibility in the Pope, is it not
 “expressly said in the Catholic principles, that this is no tenet
 “of our faith? But if no tenet of our faith, and we even do
 “not believe it as an opinion, why should we be restrained
 “from declaring, that we do not acknowledge it? Especially,
 “as it is the control of this principle, that above all other
 “considerations, excites the diffidence of our Protestant fellow
 “subjects.” Now I appeal to every reader, even the most
 “prejudiced, whether this be not an open, express and unequi-
 “vocal avowal by the Committee, that the sense, in which the
 “infallibility of the Pope was intended to have been renounced
 “by the oath, was that theological, disputed sense, which their
 “own author says, *has no pernicious tendency to hurt or dis-*
 “*turb the state; and is no article of Catholic belief.* But this
 “sense of the word *infallibility*, which leaves it as a matter of
 “opinion open for every one to hold, is evidently different from
 “that sense of it, which makes it a *pernicious* doctrine lawful
 “for nobody to hold. I hope, I have now proved to demon-
 “stration, that in one most important article, the oath has ma-

“terially deviated from the protestation. There are several
 “other instances, in which they substantially differ from each
 “other; as will appear to any one, that will attentively and
 “impartially consider them. But I gladly avoid entering into
 “redundant proofs and arguments. This will alone, I hope,
 “serve to analyze the views, spirit, and judgment, in which
 “the Committee have undertaken to represent all those to the
 “public, who, after having signed the protestation, objected
 “to take the oath. For thus do they write to the four apos-
 “tolical vicars, who had condemned the oath, as unlawful to
 “to be taken*.

“An instrument of protestation was then presented to us,
 “containing the objections of Protestants and the answers,
 “which they declared would be satisfactory. We were called
 “upon to sign this instrument;—clergy and laity, we signed.—
 “Are there among us persons capable of receding from their
 “signatures, and prostituting their honour?”

“And again—

“This protestation was converted into the form of an oath.
 “Shall we refuse to swear, when called upon by our country,
 “what we most solemnly protested under our hand-writing?—
 “The violation of an oath may accumulate the guilt of per-
 “jury or prevarication; but veracity is equally sacred, whether
 “a protestation be made upon honour, or upon oath. *Tantus*
 “*in te sit veri amor, ut quidquid dixeris, id juratum putes,*
 “was the exhortation of a father of the church, and he must
 “be destitute of Christian sincerity, who thinks he is not
 “equally bound to tell the truth without disguise, when called
 “upon to make a solemn asseveration, as if he had an oath
 “officially tendered him. To recede, therefore, from any part
 “of the protestation, would be a flagrant violation of veracity;
 “a criminal prevarication; a mortal wound to the integrity of
 “Catholics, and, consequently, an everlasting confirmation of
 “the prejudice of Protestants, that our religion permits us to
 “use duplicity and equivocation. Is it into this dishonour we

* Second Blue Book, p. 23, 24.

“are exhorted, nay required, by your Lordships, to plunge?
 “Does not authority exerted to affect this purpose, tend to
 “destruction, not to edification? And if such an authority
 “were submitted to, would not an undue respect for the mi-
 “nisters of religion involve the ruin of religion itself?—Have
 “your Lordships duly weighed these momentous consequences?”

Remember, gentle reader, that all this is said by those very persons, who in another place * address the same Apostolic Vicars in these words: “*Thus your Lordships see the ex-
 “treme deference and attention, which throughout the whole
 “course of this business, we have paid to the Apostolic Vicars.
 “We never assumed to approve or disapprove of it, as far as
 “it related to doctrines.*”

After such accusations, imputations, and insinuations, made and published by the Committee, an English reader will be surprized, that the accused have so long remained silent upon the subject; and surely this is a full apology for my submitting this statement of the case to the public†.

I have been very particular in shewing, in this one instance, that the signing of the protestation did not necessarily induce a consequential obligation of taking the oath. And as I

* Second Blue Book, p. 3.

† In the heat of the controversy between the two parties, whilst the Bill was pending in the House of Commons, a certain Baronet, who appeared to have previously communicated with the Committee, represented to the Apostolic Vicar of the London district, that any further printed publications would be of the most fatal consequence to the cause; and they therefore prevailed upon his Lordship, who ever inculcated meekness, peace and harmony by word and example, to use all his influence with his clergy, to refrain from any further publications pending the business. He recommended (what he could not enjoin) a temporary suspension of the Freedom of the Press. To an obedient and docile clergy, their pastor's wishes had the force of a command.—Immediately, however, after this sort of Paper Truce, the gentlemen of the Committee published and circulated a great many hundred copies of their Second Blue Book, which to every impartial reader, will appear little calculated to establish an union between the two then dissentient parties.

have introduced this subject, I think it a piece of justice due to all those, with whom I have the honour to think on this occasion, to state shortly to the public, that they did not object to those words of the oath, *I acknowledge no infallibility in the Pope*, merely, because they varied and deviated, both verbally and substantially from the protestation, but because, as they are introduced in the oath, they are, first, irrelevant to the purpose, for which we offered, and government accepted of a test of our civil and social principles: secondly, because they convey a sense, and go to an extent, which no Roman Catholic is warranted to carry the Denial of the Doctrine; and thirdly, because they would operate to exclude a great number of worthy and respectable Roman Catholics, who hold the doctrine or opinion, that the solemn decrees of the supreme pastor of the church, upon doctrinal matters, are irreformable, from that bounty of the legislature, which was intended to be, and has in fact been extended to all Roman Catholics indiscriminately, who would give that satisfactory test of their duty and loyalty to government, which government should think proper to require.

As to the first of these reasons, I am happy in being enabled to draw the confirmation of it from that source, which cannot be questioned nor denied by the opposite party, because their own publications are their own words and sentiments, not hastily nor unadvisedly delivered in the warmth of disputation, but fully considered, and deliberately published. They say of the oath* “It is only a declaration of the
 “innocence of our principles in *social* and *civil* concerns.—
 “Our faith is not brought forward in this oath: the rights of
 “conscience are not considered: religion is not mingled with
 “concerns of a mere temporal nature: all we are required to
 “swear, is, that we maintain no tenets, which can hinder us
 “from faithfully discharging the duties of honest men, and
 “peaceable subjects.” I leave it to more refined arguers, than I pretend to be, to render this declaration of the Com-

* First Blue Book, p. 12.

mittee consistent with their former declaration. *We never assumed to approve or disapprove of it, as far as it related to doctrines.* This, however, being the avowed intent of the oath, all *that* must be irrelevant to it, which does not answer this intent. But to prove, that the renunciation of this purely speculative opinion cannot give government any assurance of *our faithfully discharging the duties of honest men, and peaceable subjects,* I will once more repeat the words of their own select champion: "It is a question, in which none but
 " schoolmen ever engage, it being no where treated of but in
 " the Tracts of Speculative Theology, and seldom heard of be-
 " yond the precincts of the school; a question *wholly harm-*
 " *less, because purely speculative, and unconnected with eve-*
 " *ry social and moral duty of a Christian.* Its affirmative or
 " its negative may be held with equal safety to the state. Few
 " there are, it seems, who ever form a decided opinion upon
 " it. In this theological sense it can be no object of terror to
 " any man, because in this sense *it has no pernicious tendency*
 " *to hurt or disturb the state.*" And I have before proved, that in this sense alone was it introduced into the oath.

As to the 2d reason, we dissenters from the oath (since the disagreement from any opinion now makes a dissenter) have heretofore, in print, submitted our grounds of it to the public. The Corner Stone of the Roman Catholic faith, is the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church. Whether this infallibility be vested in the head of the church, or in the body of the church, is a disputed and undetermined point among them; but they all agree, that a decree of an œcumenical council, with the Pope at the head, upon doctrinal matter, is infallible.—They cannot, therefore, totally disannex the promise of Christ, to teach his church all truth to the end of time, from the head of the church: and consequently do not think themselves warranted in swearing, that they admit no infallibility in the Pope: for that would be false, if he in any manner partake of this promise of Christ; much more so, if

that promise were made to St. Peter as to the head of the church, and to his successors in that capacity. They do not, moreover, feel themselves justified in swearing, that the Holy Ghost never has, nor never will inspire the visible head of the Church to teach or enforce the truth of God; in which case there was, or would be some infallibility in the Pope, inasmuch as what he would declare or teach under such inspiration, must essentially be infallible and irreformable: and hence it is inferred, that the Pope has some infallibility in him; and there are many grave and respectable authors, who allow a portion of it to every Bishop. In a word, to swear, that there is no infallibility in the Pope, seems to go to the full extent of swearing, that he is, as head of the church, absolutely incapable, in any possible case, of receiving that influence or direction of the Holy Spirit, which must render the decrees pronounced in consequence of it, eternally true and irreformable. In this sense, infallibility and truth become synonymous: for the truth of the Holy Spirit of God must essentially be infallible: and I believe no Roman Catholic will deliberately swear, that he acknowledges no such *truth* in the supreme head of his church*.

Without troubling the reader with a detail of the intermediate communications and intercourse relating to this oath, I shall lay before them a letter from three out of the four Vicars Apostolic. It must be remarked, that † the Bishop of the Midland district, (Talbot) who had declared, that his objection to the former oath was it's deviation from the protestation in that part of it, which related to the interference of the power of Christ's Church. *That being restored, he declared he should no longer have any objection to the oath, as it then stood:—* This being accordingly done at the next general meeting of the Catholics, he was appointed to be of the Committee in the room of his deceased venerable brother. He declared verbally, as it is said, (though he never could be induced to do it in writing),

* Ca. St. p. 72 to 86.

† Ca. Stat. 132, 3.

that he thought the oath was now admissible. The other Bishops still remained of a different opinion. They appear not to have been consulted upon the alterations, nor apprized of them, when they were made. Their sentiments, however, upon all the intermediate proceedings of the committee, will be more fairly and fully set before the public in their own words.

* “ **ENCYCLICAL LETTER.**

“ *Charles, Bishop of Rama, Vicar Apostolic of the Western*
 “ *District ; William, Bishop of Acanthos, Vicar Apostolic*
 “ *of the Northern District ; and John, Bishop of Centu-*
 “ *ria, Vicar Apostolic of the Southern District.*

“ To all the FAITHFUL, CLERGY and LAITY, of those respective Districts.

“ WE think it necessary to lay before you the following articles and determinations :

“ 1st. We are informed that the Catholic committee has given
 “ in, or intends to give in, a bill, containing an oath, to be pre-
 “ sented to parliament, in order to be sanctioned by the Legis-
 “ lature, and to be tendered to the Catholics of this kingdom.

“ 2dly. The four apostolic vicars, by an Encyclical Letter,
 “ dated October 21, 1789, condemned an oath, proposed at
 “ that time to be presented to parliament ; and which oath they
 “ also declared unlawful to be taken. Their condemnation of
 “ that oath was confirmed by the Apostolic See, and sanctioned
 “ also by the bishops of Ireland and Scotland.

“ 3dly. Some alteration has been made by the Catholic com-
 “ mittee in that condemned oath : but, as far as we have learned,
 “ of no moment : consequently the altered oath remains liable
 “ to the censure fixed on the former oath.

“ 4thly. The four apostolical vicars in the above-mentioned
 “ Encyclical Letter declared, that none of the faithful, clergy,
 “ nor laity, ought to take any new oath, or sign any new de-
 “ claration in doctrinal matters, or subscribe any new instru-
 “ ment, wherein the interests of religion are concerned, without

“ the previous approbation of their respective bishop, and they
 “ required submission to those determinations. The altered oath
 “ has not been approved by us, and therefore cannot be lawfully
 “ or conscientiously taken by any of the faithful of our districts.

“ 5thly. We further declare, that the assembly of the Ca-
 “ tholic committee has no right or authority to determine on the
 “ lawfulness of oaths, declarations, or other instruments what-
 “ soever containing doctrinal matters; but that this authority
 “ resides in the bishops, they being, by divine institution, the
 “ spiritual governors in the church of Christ, and the guardians
 “ of religion.

“ In consequence, likewise, of the preceding observations,
 “ we condemn, in the fullest manner, the attempt of offering
 “ to parliament an oath, including doctrinal matters, to be
 “ there sanctioned, which has not been approved by us; and
 “ if such attempt be made, we earnestly exhort the Catholics
 “ of our respective districts to oppose it, and hinder its being
 “ carried into execution; and for that purpose to present a
 “ protestation or counter-petition, or to adopt whatever other
 “ legal and prudent measures may be judged best.

“ Finally, We also declare, that conformably to the letter
 “ written to the Catholic committee by the four apostolical
 “ vicars, October 21, 1789, we totally disapprove of the
 “ appellation of *Protesting Catholic Dissenters* given us in the
 “ bill, and of three provisoes therein contained, and expressed
 “ in the said letter of the four apostolical vicars.

“ We shall here conclude, with expressing to you our hopes,
 “ that you have rejected with detestation some late publica-
 “ tions, and that you will beware of others, which may appear
 “ hereafter. Of those, that have been published, some are
 “ schismatical, scandalous, inflammatory, and insulting to the
 “ supreme head of the church, the vicar of Jesus Christ.

“ + CHARLES RAMATAN, V. A.

“ + WILLIAM ACANTHEN, V. A.

“ + JOHN CENTURIEN, V. A.

“ London, Jan. 19, 1791.”

I wish not to press more of this matter upon the mind of my reader, than will conclusively evince the identity of the spirit of *Richerism* operating upon the author of the blue books in 1791, and the author of five letters or addresses to Irishmen in 1810, 1811, and 1812. I wished to lay that subtle spirit with as gentle a lenitive, as would be efficient. I then spoke of it in the following manner: “+ When these “didactic gentlemen pronounce with such precision, that “*the oath contains no ambiguity, and that it is nothing “but a promise of that allegiance, which every govern- “ment has a right to claim from its subjects,*” they seem closely to have aped the insidious principles of the French National Assembly, in demanding a test from their clergy, which they call the *serment civique*, that goes in fact to renounce and annihilate the first principles of spiritual subordination, and which must necessarily involve the subscribers to it in direct and formal schism. *We* execrate such principles; and, as dutiful and faithful subjects of his Majesty, we grieve at every attempt to import them from our Gallic neighbours into this country. It was in the indispensable discharge of their pastoral duty, that our vicars apostolic exercised the plenitude of their spiritual power and jurisdiction, to crush, in their infancy, the baneful effects of these newly devised and newly imported doctrines from France.

The true disciples of the *Richerian* school have ever signalized themselves by craftily crouching under defeat, and in their overbearing use of victory. The party failed in that subtle attempt; and remained nearly eighteen years crest-fallen, and apparently inactive. *But their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched.* (Is. 66. 24.)

The unfortunate Veto controversy, the unsuccessful canvas for the see of Elphin, and the firm and unanimous stand made by the Catholic hierarchy of Ireland against Vetoists, Blan-

chardists, and other novelists being coeval, roused the party from their silence and inaction; and behold steps forth the self-confident Goliath of *Richerism*, (*ipse Agmen*) proclaiming, as I said before, interminable war against the power and jurisdiction of the Pope and the religion and hierarchy of his countrymen.* Having placed before the eyes of the most learned Doctor some of the thoughts, which I expressed twenty years back, concerning a *test trap* then set for the English Catholics, it remains for me to furnish him with some observations, which at the same time I had occasion to make upon the *mock docility* of the *trap-setters*. I doubt not, but I shall awaken all the energies of his capacious mind, and I anticipate his greedy sympathies in all the variety of forms, which he has brought together in his 4th Number 66. “Subscripsi, collaudi, annui, confirmavi, consignavi, consolidavi, firmavi, cum gaudio, consensi, acquievi, confortavi, corroboravi, conclusi, consentiens subscripsi, concessi, propriâ manu confirmo, signo crucis confirmo, libenter annuo, gratum habui, concedo, pro viribus assensum præbeo.”†

* To ascertain all the private and suppressed motives of the actors in some very important scenes, baffles the powers of the most *erudite*, sagacious, and faithful historian. It is however his duty to unravel as much of the secret mechanism as he can. In a system, where wheel works within wheel with more complicity than in the cumbrous hydraulic machine at Marly, much is gained, if a single movement be ascertained. The moment of Columbanus’ conviction, that it was impracticable for him to reach Elphin *via Romæ*, threw him into an incredible degree of credulity. He became sensibly affected with what the Bishop of Metz, (2 Col. 23) in the name of the council of Cardinals, stated to O’Nial, namely, that they had discovered an *Irish prophecy*, which “said, ‘that the church of Rome must fall, if the Catholic faith is overthrown in Ireland!’” Columbanus’ *faith* in the prophecy excited his *hope* to put down the tiara, and fired his *charity* to *acathollocize* his country.

† For the benefit of my country readers, I must attempt the drudgery of a translation into English of these prolific powers of assent and approbation: a graduated D.D. and Member of the Academy of Cortona would not condescend to the servile task. “I have subscribed, I have joined in praise, I have assented, I have confirmed, I have

Those Gentlemen having repeatedly boasted of their *having* *paid extreme deference and attention throughout the whole course of the business to the apostolic vicars, and having in their 2d blue book enumerated their multifarious merits, conclude with this self-sufficient interrogatory, (p. 5) *What more than this could have been expected from the most docile members of Christ's church?* They tell them however, (p. 2) *that nothing was true* of the general substance of one of their pastoral letters to their flocks. In the same page, they interrogate their prelates with a supercilious air of didactic arrogance, which has no example. *Why then, my Lords, precipitate matters? Why circulate this defamatory mandate? Have the faithful been edified by it? Has it served the cause of religion? Has it recommended Catholics to the favor of the nation?*

“It is curious to observe, how rapidly these *docile members* of Christ's church advance in the climax of their deference and attention to their spiritual pastors. “Thus,† my Lords, in “our regard, no preliminaries, either of form or right were “attended to. Is it possible to suppose your heavenly Master “inspired a conduct so opposite to his own spirit of prudence, “meekness, conciliation, and justice; or that your Lordships “spoke the language of the church, when you acted in a manner so little conformable to its practice? Thus wandering “from your proper directions, we are not surprised at your “errors.”

With this same *extreme deference and submission* to their spiritual superiors, these prudent, meek, conciliating and just men, seem never to tire in arraigning the conduct of their bishops. “‡ Surely, my Lords, when your Lordships act

“joined in signing, I have affirmed with glee, I have consented, I have “acquiesced, I have also strengthened, I have corroborated, I have concluded, consenting I have subscribed, I have granted, with my own “hand I confirm, with the sign of the cross I confirm, I willingly assent, “I have found it agreeable, I do grant, I give my utmost assent.”

* Ca. Stat. 118.

† 2d Blue Book, p. 15.

‡ 2d Blue Book, p. 16.

“with so much precipitancy, when you shew such little attention to the forms or substance of justice, when you shew yourselves so unconvertant with the subjects, on which you pronounce your determinations so decisively: when there is so much contradiction in your opinions, and so much disagreement amongst yourselves, &c.”

Some few of my readers, who claim a right to judge for themselves, will, I fear, think, that these very great lovers of truth, who have said of themselves, *that they have paid extreme deference and submission throughout the whole course of this business to the vicars apostolic*, had better pause a little, before they venture to swear, to what they have thus roundly asserted. For before the whole business was concluded, they tell these same vicars apostolic, “My Lords, your pretensions to authority, in the manner you have exercised it, being thus set aside, your decrees must necessarily sink into mere matters of private opinion.”

But lest there might still remain a doubt upon the mind of any one, that all acts of deference and submission had not been done towards their spiritual superiors, which could be made or done by the *most docile members of Christ's church*, they wind up the climax of their humility and obedience, by an hyperbole, that surpasses all precedent, and scarcely admits of belief.

*Your Lordships having brought matters to this point:**

“Convinced, that we have not been misled by our clergy; convinced, that we have not violated any article of Catholic faith or communion, we, the Catholic Committee, whose names are here under-written, for ourselves, and for those, in whose trusts we have acted, do hereby, before God, solemnly protest, and call upon God to witness our protest, against your Lordships' Encyclical Letters, of the 19th day of October, 1789, and the 21st day of January last, and every clause, article, determination, matter, and thing therein respectively contained,

* Second Blue Book, sub. fin.

as imprudent, *arbitrary and unjust*; as a total misrepresentation of the nature of the bills, to which they respectively refer, *and the oaths therein respectively contained*; and our conduct relating thereto respectively, as encroaching on our natural, civil, and *religious rights*, inculcating principles hostile to society and government, *and the constitution and laws of the British empire: as derogatory from the allegiance we owe to the state, and the settlement of the crown*: and as tending to continue, encrease and confirm the prejudices against the faith and moral character of the Catholics, and the *scandal and oppression*, under which they labour in this kingdom. In the same manner we do hereby solemnly protest, and call upon God to witness, this our solemn protest, against all proceedings had, *or hereafter to be had*, in consequence of, or grounded upon your Lordships' said Encyclical Letters, or either of them, or any representation of the bills or oaths therein respectively referred to, *given or to be given by your Lordships, or any of you.*

“ And from your Lordships said Encyclical Letters, and all proceedings had, or hereafter to be had in consequence of, or grounded upon the same, or either of them, or in consequence of, or grounded upon any *representations* of the said bills, or oaths, or either of them, given, or to be given by your Lordships, or any of you, we do hereby appeal, and call on God to witness our appeal, for the purity and integrity of our religious principles, to all the Catholic churches in the universe, and especially to the first of Catholic churches, the Apostolic See, rightly informed.

Charles Berrington

Jos. Wilks

Stourton

Petre

Henry Charles Englefield

John Lawson

John Throckmorton

William Fermor

John Townely

Thomas Hornyold.”

Tantus in te sit veri amor, ut quidquid dixeris, id juratum putes is the most excellent device, that could be imagined for persons, who are so ready to swear to all they have said, and so perfectly correct in all they advance."

I thus spoke of the *would-be-protesting Catholic dissenters* in 1791. " *I have, indeed, charged them with inconsistency, whether with or without reason my readers must judge. But I should not do them complete justice, if I did not lay also before the public their consistency. It cannot be forgotten, with what ambitious eagerness they have attempted to assume the title of *protestants* and *dissenters*; upon this *prominent feature of their plans, their merit chiefly rests*. Of their claim to the latter appellation of *dissenters*, they have, throughout their two publications, given ample, and most unequivocal testimony; they do not only, as they themselves say,† *dissent in certain points of faith from the church of England*, but they also *dissent* in opinions from their own spiritual superiors, and the greatest number of their own brethren; they *dissent* from all those members of the Catholic Church, who allow and submit to the authority of their bishops in determining the admissibility and lawfulness of oaths; they *dissent* from all those English Roman Catholics, who prayed and petitioned Parliament, to do those things, which Parliament has found it liberal and wise to do: they *dissent* from such members of government and the legislature, as have thought proper to countenance, encourage, and reward the obedience and submission of individuals to their lawful spiritual superiors, in confirming and sanctioning their injunctions to their flocks, by a solemn act of the legislature; they *dissent* from the respectable hierarchy of Ireland and Scotland, and even from the reverend bench of Protestant bishops in their opinions upon the propriety of the oath; they *dissent* from those respectable members of the legislature, who have disapproved of the form of their bill; they *dissent* from their own author, in representing

* Ca. Stat. p. 170 to 180.

† First Blue Book, p. 2.

their own actions ; they *dissent* from themselves in their assertions to the public ; and, I flatter myself, that they *dissent* from the nation, or rather the nation *dissents* from them, in their judgment of us, who have so successfully opposed their measures. And here shall I leave these *dissenting* gentlemen in the full uninterrupted enjoyment of their *dissenting talents and dispositions**.

But they seem to have claimed, with still more earnestness and ambition, the appellation of *Protestants*, which they claim title to, *because they have protested, and are willing to protest against, and do declare, they do not hold the doctrines attributed to them*†. Flushed with the self-assumed merit of this *prominent feature*, they usher into public an elaborate detail, narrative, or vindication of their proceedings in their commission ; and lest parliament and the nation should not think them worthy of or entitled to this new honour, they resolve, before the finishing of their career, to convince the public, at least, that they did not lay in their claim to the appellation of *Protestants*, without the most eminent talents and dispositions for *protesting* ; and they are peculiarly select in the subject, which they have chosen for the display of their talents. I must here beg my reader to throw back his eye upon the protestation, which I have before quoted.

They are not only satisfied to protest for themselves, ‡ but they do it also solemnly before God, for those, in whose trusts

* They seem however to *dissent* little from some other *dissenters* in their deference and affection for the mitre.

† First Blue Book, p. 2.

‡ I hope these protesting gentlemen do not by this mean to enlist every one under their protesting banners, who voted for their election and nomination to their trust, but such only as continued to approve and support their measures through the whole of the business. It is one thing to be appointed to a trust, and another thing faithfully to discharge the trust. They call themselves a committee to watch over and promote the public interests of the English Roman Catholics. I call those the real guardians and protectors of their public interests, who have stood forth, and laboured successfully, to procure the greatest civil advantage from

they act, *and they call upon God to witness their protest*, against the first Encyclical Letter of the four Apostolic Vicars, and against the second Encyclical Letter of the three Apostolic Vicars, herein-before cited, and every *article, determination, matter, and thing, therein respectively contained*. Thus they are not only contented to protest against the point in dispute or question, which is the right of the bishops to censure the oath, but so infatuated are they with this new exercise, that they rush head-long into the course determined to distance every competitor, that had ever started from the same goal; and I am very ready to believe, that no Protestant in future, of any denomination, will attempt to enter the lists with these protesting champions. Every clause, article, determination, matter, and thing, in these letters, is by them protested against. They, therefore, *protest*, in the first place, against the fact, that the persons signing them are, in reality, bishops, and vicars apostolic of the districts therein mentioned. *They protest against* their having used mature deliberation, or any previous discussion, before they condemned the oath in question: *They protest against* the actual condemnation of that oath: *They protest against* its being intended for the Catholics: *They protest against* its publication in Woodfall's Register: *They protest*, that there are no faithful clergy, or laity, under the care of these apostolic vicars; and still more, do they *protest* against any right, which their bishops have, to signify any approbation of the oath. *They protest*, that the restoration of peace to the minds of the faithful, cannot promote their spiritual welfare: *They protest against* their having given in, or intended to give in a bill containing an oath to be presented to parliament, in order that it should be sanctioned by the legislature, and be tendered

the nation, which extends unexceptionably and indiscriminately to every one of the Roman Catholic body. Such is the late act of parliament passed in our favour. And *that* we owe to the exertions and efforts of the apostolic vicars and those, who acted under and with them; and I blush to add, that the sole opposition to their efforts arose from the gentlemen of the committee and their adherents.

to the Catholics of this kingdom: *They protest* against the fact of the oaths having been also condemned by the apostolic see, and by the bishops of Ireland and Scotland: *They protest* against any alteration having been made by themselves in the oath between the 21st of October, 1789, and the 19th of January, 1791: *They protest* against the fact of any publication having been lately made, that was schismatical, scandalous, inflammatory, and insulting to the supreme head of the church, the vicar of Jesus Christ; and consequently *they protest* against the supreme head of the church being the vicar of Jesus Christ. These are *matters and things* contained in the Encyclical Letters; and lest any such matter or thing should escape from under the operation of this their all-grasping *protest*, they expressly *protest against every clause and article*, in which these matters and things are contained.

Although persons, who do not hold communion with the church of Rome, will readily protest against any authority of the bishops of that church over them, yet few would, I believe protest, as the committee have done for themselves and others, against their authority and jurisdiction over the members of the Roman Catholic church within their respective districts. The committee have said*, Thus publicly *we have acknowledged ourselves members of the Catholic church*: and in order to shew how inconsistent they still are with themselves in the very letter, which contains this unparalleled sample of *protesting*, they thus address themselves to these very bishops: “Respect-
“able for your exemplary piety, your missionary zeal, and
“your many other moral and religious endowments, your lord-
“ships are entitled to the utmost attention and respect; the
“utmost attention and respect we ever paid, and shall ever pay
“you. When you deliver to us the solemn decisions of the
“church, when you exhort, persuade, or instruct, we know
“you are within the sphere of your pastoral duty.” And yet do they expressly *protest* against the instructions they give to

* 2d Blue Book, p. 14.

their flocks, when they say, that laymen *have no right, no authority, to determine on the lawfulness of oaths, declarations, or other instruments whatsoever, containing doctrinal matters but that this authority resides in the bishops, they being, by divine institution, the spiritual governors in the church of Christ, and the guardians of religion.* They protest against their exhortation to the Catholics of their respective districts, to oppose and hinder the introduction of any oath into a bill before parliament, which shall not have been approved of by them; and they also protest against their *exhortations, persuasions, and instructions* to their flocks, to reject with detestation, schismatical, scandalous, and inflammatory publications.

These new *protesting* gentlemen are not only not contented with *protesting* against all these matters, things, articles, clauses, and determinations; but they push their protestations still further; and, by them annex the blackest and most envenomed motives, that can be devised, to the reverend prelates, who signed the Encyclical Letters. They protest against them as *imprudent, arbitrary, and unjust; as totally misrepresenting* that bill, which the legislature has thought proper to accommodate to the wishes and suggestions of these very prelates; and that oath, which upon their representation the legislature has also rejected. This *protesting* mania has endowed its votaries with a new spirit of divination, to find out, that these Encyclical Letters encroach on the *natural, civil, and religious rights* of men; that they inculcate principles hostile to society and government, and the constitution and laws of the British empire. In a word, it has converted these prelates (whom the committee avowed to respect and revere) into open and direct rebels and traitors to their king and country: For *they protest* against these Encyclical Letters, as *derogatory from the allegiance we owe to the state and settlement of the crown.*

After these protesting gentlemen have attempted, by their newly adopted art, to conform known, peaceable, moral, religious, and respectable characters, into impostors, usurpers,

deceivers, seducers, robbers, savages, rebels, and traitors, we shall not be surprized at their attempts to advance one step further, and endeavour to make a Protestant nation join with them in opinion and judgment. But as in their first effort they were defeated by the extremity of their own extravagance, so were they in the second by the good sense, candour, and uprightness of those, whom they wished to gain over. So far from these Encyclical Letters having *tended to continue, increase and confirm the prejudices against the faith and moral character of Catholics, and the scandal and oppression, under which they laboured in this kingdom*, that it was principally, if not wholly, owing to the effects of these very letters, that the legislature has, in its bountiful liberality admitted the whole body of Roman Catholics into the benefit of the laws, and participation of the constitution. I did once before, and I do now again, once for all, warn these gentlemen against the insolent presumption of undertaking for their Protestant brethren, to pass judgment and sentence upon us.

It should seem, that the art of *protesting* had now been carried to the highest possible degree of sublimation: but no check nor limits, civil, moral, or divine, were to be put upon the rage, with which these infatuated protesters, pursued the authors of the two Encyclical Letters. Not contented to *protest* against all, that had already been said, written, or done upon the business in question, they in *like manner do solemnly protest and* (*horresco referens*) *they call upon God to witness this solemn protest against all proceedings had, or hereafter to be had, in consequence of, or grounded upon the said two Encyclical Letters, or either of them, or any representation of the bills or oaths therein respectively referred to, given or to be given by them, or any of them*: Thus do they not only protest against every act, word, and motive of their apostolical vicars, but even against the possibility of any future word, action, or motive, being produced by them upon this subject, conformable with the dictates of human prudence, the requisitions of the laws of their country, or the counsels

and precepts of Almighty God. For, unless Almighty God should, in the utmost severity of his wrath, withdraw from these apostolical vicars the freedom of their wills and actions, and refuse them every future grace in this life, what human being can by possibility know, that they, or some or one of them, will not hereafter speak, write, or act in a manner agreeable both to the laws of God and man?

In no age, in no country, in no circumstances was there ever, to my knowledge, an accusation preferred against any man, or any set of men, of a blacker and more complicated nature, than this protestation by the Protesting Dissenting Catholic Committee, against their lawful superiors. They appear to have consulted a table of sins, in order to collect into one catalogue all possible offences, of which these vicars apostolic could be guilty; and, if they will make true their charges, much as I now respect and revere the private and public characters of these truly apostolical prelates, I will join cordially with the committee in protesting against them, as guilty of imprudence, tyranny, and injustice; of deceit, error, and seduction; of malice, slander, and detraction; of usurpation, robbery, and impiety; of sedition, rebellion, and treason; of immorality, oppression, and scandal; and not only, as now guilty of these misdemeanors, offences, and crimes, but as incapable of repenting of and amending any of them, and so necessarily remaining guilty of each of them for evermore."

No. V.

* "The four articles of the Gallican Church, rejected by the Bishops of Ireland, as above, p. 5.

I. Jesus Christ has given to St. Peter and to his successors a *spiritual power*, which relates only to *salvation in a life to come*. He has given him no power directly or indirectly over temporal concerns: consequently St. Peter's successors have no power of deposing kings, or of absolving subjects from their oaths of allegiance. *Why have our Bishops rejected this?* See above p. 5.

II. The plenitude of the power given to St. Peter's successors over spiritual concerns does not derogate from what the Council of Constance has defined in it's fourth and fifth session, touching the *superior authority* of General Councils: and the Gallican Church disapproves of all attempts to question the authority of those decrees of the Council of Constance, or to ~~ende~~ *diminute* their force, by confining their operation to cases of schism. *Why have our Bishops rejected this?*

III. The exercise of the Apostolical power of the holy See ought to be *governed by the canons*, which have been enacted by the Spirit of God, and are respected by all the world: and the rules, as well as the customs or usages, which are received in the kingdom and church of France, ought to have force.

IV. It is the Pope's office chiefly to decide in matters of *revealed faith*, and his *decrees* are obligatory throughout the universal Church. His decrees, however, are not to be admitted as *absolute rules of faith*, until after they are *adopted by the Church*."

I now lay before my reader the original Latin declaration of the Gallican clergy, which I have endeavoured to translate into English with punctilious scrupulosity *de verbo in verbum*, as far as the Latin and English idioms will permit. I shall then offer some few remarks upon the document brought before the public by Columbanus.

CLERI GALLICANI

De Ecclesiastica postestate Declaratio,

DIE 19 MARTII 1682,

Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ decreta & liberales à majoribus nostris tanto studio propugnatas, earumque fundamenta sacris canonibus & Patrum traditione nixa multi diruere moliuntur; nec desunt, qui earum obtentu primatum beati Petri ejusque successorum Romanorum Pontificum à Christo institutum, iisque debitam ab omnibus Christianis obedientiam, Sedisque Apostolicæ, in quâ fides prædicatur, & unitas servatur Ecclesiæ, reverendam omnibus gentibus majestatem imminuere non vereantur. Hæc.

tici quoque nihil prætermittunt, quo eam potestatem, quâ pax Ecclesiæ continetur, invidiosam & gravem Regibus & populis ostentent, iisque fraudibus simplices animas ab Ecclesiæ Matris Christique adeo communione dissociant. Quæ ut incommoda propulsemus, Nos, Archiepiscopi & Episcopi Parisiis mandato Regio congregati Ecclesiam Gallicanam repræsentantes, unâ cum ceteris Ecclesiasticis viris nobiscum deputatis, diligenti tractatu habito hæc sancienda & declaranda esse duximus.

I. Primùm beato Petro ejusque successoribus Christi Vicariis ipsique Ecclesiæ rerum spiritualium & ad æternam salutem pertinentium, non autem civilium ac temporalium, à Deo traditam potestatem, dicente Domino, *Regnum meum non est de hoc mundo*, & iterum, *Reddite ergo quæ sunt Cæsaris Cæsari & quæ sunt Dei Deo*, ac proinde stare apostolicum illud. *Omnis anima potestatibus sublimioribus subdita sit. Non est enim potestas nisi à Deo. Quæ autem sunt, à Deo ordinata sunt. Itaque qui potestati resistit, Dei ordinationi resistit.* Reges ergo & Principes in temporalibus nulli ecclesiasticæ potestati Dei ordinatione subjici, neque autoritate clavium Ecclesiæ directè vel indirectè deponi, aut illorum subditos eximi à fide atque obedientiâ, ac præstito fidelitatis sacramento solvi posse, eamque sententiam publicæ tranquillitati necessariam, nec minùs Ecclesiæ quàm Imperio utilem, ut verbo Dei, Patrum traditioni, & Sanctorum exemplis consonam omninò retinendam.

II. Sic autem inesse Apostolicæ Sedi ac Petri successoribus Christi Vicariis rerum spiritualium plenam potestatem, ut simul valeant atque immota consistent sanctæ œcumenicæ Synodi Constantiensis à Sede Apostolica comprobata, ipsoque Romanorum Pontificum ac totius Ecclesiæ usu confirmata, atque ab Ecclesia Gallicana perpetua religione custodita decreta de autoritate Conciliorum generalium, quæ sessione quarta & quinta continentur, nec probari à Gallicana Ecclesia qui eorum decretorum, quasi dubiæ sint autoritatis ac minùs approbata, robur infringant, aut ad solum schismatis tempus Concilii dicta detorqueant.

III. Hinc Apostolicæ potestatis usum moderandum per canones spiritu Dei conditos & totius mundi reverentia consecratos. Valere etiam regulas, mores et instituta à regno & Ecclesia

Gallicana recepta, patrumque terminos manere inconcussos; atque id pertinere ad amplitudinem Apostolicæ Sedis, ut statuta & consuetudines tantæ Sedis & Ecclesiarum consensione firmatæ propriam stabilitatem obtineant.

IV. In fidei quoque quæstionibus præcipuas summi Pontificis esse partes, ejusque decreta ad omnes & singulas Ecclesias pertinere, nec tamen irreformabile esse judicium nisi Ecclesiæ consensus accesserit.

V. Quæ accepta à patribus ad omnes Ecclesias Gallicanas atque Episcopos in Spiritu Sancto authore præsidentes mittenda decrevimus; ut idipsum dicamus omnes, simusque in eodem sensu & in eadem sententia.

A very literal translation of the above important Latin document, made under correction of any competent judge. N. B. I challenge not comparison by reference to *manuscript* or *unpublished* works.

DECLARATION OF THE GALLICAN CLERGY,

CONCERNING

ECCLESIASTICAL POWER.

March 19, 1682.

Many endeavour to put down the decrees and liberties of the Gallican church, contended for with so much zeal by our ancestors, and their foundations resting upon the sacred canons, and the traditions of the fathers; nor are there wanting some, who under colour of them, do not fear to derogate from the primacy of blessed Peter and his successors, the bishops of Rome, instituted by Christ, and from the obedience due to them from all Christians, and to fritter down the Majesty to be revered by all nations of the apostolic see, in which the faith is preached, and the unity of the church is preserved. The heretics likewise omit nothing, by which they may represent that power, in which the peace of the church is embraced, as invidious and burthensome to kings and potentates: and by

those frauds, they sever simple souls from the communion of the mother church, and consequently from that of Christ. To obviate which inconveniencies, we the Arch-bishops and Bishops convened at Paris by royal mandate, representing the Gallican church, together with the other clergymen deputed together with us, after diligent deliberation, have thought these things ought to be decreed and declared.

First. That there was given by God to blessed Peter and his successors, the vicars of Christ, and to the church, a power over spiritual things, and appertaining to eternal salvation, but not over civil or temporal things; the Lord saying, *my kingdom is not of this world:* and again, *Render therefore unto Cæsar, the things, which are Cæsar's, and unto God the things, which are God's:* and therefore that saying of the apostle holds good, *Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers: for there is no power but of God: whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God:* and therefore, that kings and princes in temporalities are by the ordinance of God subjected to no ecclesiastical power, nor may be deposed directly or indirectly by the authority of the keys of the church, or may their subjects be absolved from their allegiance and obedience, or their oath of allegiance sworn to them: and that this opinion necessary for the conservation of the public tranquillity, and no less useful to the church than the state, as being consonant with the word of God, the tradition of the fathers, and the examples of the saints, ought to be unquestionably maintained.

Second. But that the plenary power over spiritual things, is so vested in the apostolic See, and the successors of Peter, the vicars of Christ, as that the decrees concerning the authority of general councils contained in the 4th and 5th sessions of the holy œcumenical council of Constance, which have been approved of by the apostolic See, and confirmed by the actual practice of the Roman pontiffs, and of the whole church, and preserved unceasingly and religiously by the Gallican Church, are at the same time of full avail and remain unshaken. Neither

are they approved of by the Gallican church, who derogate from the force of those decrees, as if they were of doubtful authority, or not fully approved of: or who distort the words of the council, by applying them only to the time of schism.

Third. Hence the exercise of the apostolic power ought to be regulated by the canons framed by the spirit of God, and consecrated by the veneration of the whole world. The rules, customs, and institutions received by the kingdom and church of France are also still in force, and the decisions of the fathers remain unshaken: and it is appurtenant to the greatness of the apostolic See, that the statutes and customs sanctioned by the assent of so great a See, and of the diffusive church should possess their peculiar full efficacy.

Fourth. In questions of faith also, it belongs principally to the chief pontiff to decide, and his decrees reach to all and singular the (dispersed) churches. Yet nevertheless, his decision is not irreformable, unless followed by the consent (acquiescence) of the church.

Which having been received by the fathers, we have decreed them to be sent to all the Gallican churches, and to the bishops governing them in the authority of the holy Spirit, that we may all say the same thing, and be of the same mind, and of the same opinion."

Then follow the Signatures.

To the unbiassed reader I offer a very short *scholium* on the copy, readings, edition or quotation of the declaration of the Gallican clergy, on ecclesiastical power, in 1682, by the Rev. Doctor, who boasts (3 Col. 74) that *he has a character yet to lose: that he cannot charge his conscience with misrepresentation: and that truth is the first duty of every writer.* The preamble, setting forth the views, motives, and grounds for making that declaration were not kept out of sight, for its length, intricacy, or insignificancy; but, because it set forth in too plain a language, the high prerogatives, the jurisdictional authority, and the obligatory obedience due by divine

institution, from all Christians to the chair of Peter. Neither was it for the mere sake of abbreviation, that so much of the first proposition was omitted, as will by comparison appear: particularly those very important words, *the Vicars of Christ*, which in the original immediately follow the words, *Peter and his successors*.* This use of the word *him*, instead of *them*, might give room to doubt, whether the fathers convened might not have confined the investiture of spiritual power personally to St. Peter, without extending it to his successors in the See of Rome.

In the second proposition, there is a repeated omission of those important words, which the fathers convened so studiously again introduced, not to leave a doubt upon the minds of their and the church's enemies, that the Gallican church differed in one iota from the church diffusive upon this cardinal pivot of Catholicity. His views and motives need not to be analyzed, to discover the genuine ground of his omitting after the word *Constance* in the original, the following most material words, viz. *which have been confirmed by the actual practice of the Roman Pontiffs, and of the whole church, and preserved unceasingly and religiously by the Gallican church*; or of his introducing the words, *touching the superior authority of general councils*, in lieu of *de auctoritate conciliorum*, touching the authority of general councils.

In the first line Columbanus introduces the words *holy See*, which occur not in the original. But the smothering of the

* I have before noticed, that *Peter Walsh* following the most Catholic and illustrious *Richer*, *Launois*, &c. held that there was only in the Pope, *a primacy of power over the whole world, not a supremacy, and consequently neither a vicarship nor headship*, &c. and this avowed denier of the *vicarship or headship* to the Pope is the man, whom Columbanus throughout his five numbers holds up to his countrymen, as the most learned of his order, a man of untainted orthodoxy, of exemplary conduct, a favourite of *Ormond*, because a persecuted victim of episcopal hatred and papal oppression.

latter part of the third proposition is of a piece with his invincible rule of suppressing or distorting every thing, that tends to enforce respect and obedience to the chair of Peter. If the reader will give himself the trouble of comparing the translation of the fourth proposition, (which is the least disfigured) he will not find it translated with that close punctilious accuracy, which such awful subjects require.

To the end of the second proposition Columbanus puts the following note, "These two decrees of this council merit the more attention, because the second, intimately connected with the first, happens unfortunately to be that, which the Irish Bishops have condemned in their synod of Tullow, as above, 29." And by reference to p. 29, the reader will find, that Columbanus says, he is extremely sorry to be compelled *by truth* to charge the Irish Bishops with having condemned in that synod the following proposition: *Pius VII. would be a heretic and schismatic, if he renounced or condemned a solemn decision of the Catholic Church.* There can hardly be more barefaced misrepresentation, than this charge against the Irish Bishops, (made by him who knew it to be false) that they had condemned this hypothetical proposition: that is *in itself*, as containing falsehood and error. Whereas, the Bishops expressly say of that proposition: *This proposition separately taken is equivocal: but it is to be considered along with the three following.* The acts of that Synod are (App. No. VI.) submitted to the reader at length, in support of the truth and justice of that venerable hierarchy, and the exposure of the petulant fractiousness and want of candour in their impugner; maugre his thrasonical assurance, that *he never perverted the words of any man to answer his own purposes of malignity or revenge.* How free, how very free from any such corrupt motive does the most learned Doctor, *cy devant soi disant Columbanus* appear in the sublime conclusion of that very 29th page, so pregnant with truth, candor

and *Irish honesty*. “ If the Bishop of Castabala is to judge
 “ *exclusively*, according to his Turkish notions, he is a Synod
 “ in himself! *Iipse agmen*.—Poor dear man. I recommend it
 “ to him to *read more*, and to *write less*.!!!” (3 Col. 29)

No. VI.

*Declaration of the Roman Catholic Prelates of Ireland, con-
 cerning certain Opinions lately published in England.*



“ Whereas We the underwritten Archbishops and Bishops
 “ of the Roman Catholic Church of Ireland, have been called
 “ upon to declare our judgment concerning certain opinions
 “ lately published in England, and there condemned by our
 “ Right Rev. Brothers, the Bishops of Centuriæ and Castabala,
 “ Vicars Apostolical; from which condemnation a pretended
 “ appeal has been conveyed to us, in a book entitled, *Abus*
 “ *sans Example de l'Autorité Ecclésiastique, pour flétrir*
 “ *et opprimer l'Innocence, &c. &c.* By Pierre Louis
 “ Blanchard, styling himself *Curé de St. Hyppolite, Diocèse*
 “ *de Lisieux, Normandie. A Londres, de l'imprimerie de*
 “ *R. Juigné, 17, Margaret-street, Cavendish-square. Se*
 “ *vend chez M. De la Roche, 5, King-street, Portman-*
 “ *square; et chez l'Auteur, 81, High-street, Mary-le-bone,*
 “ 1808.

“ And whereas the said Pierre Louis Blanchard has signified
 “ in his said book, that he will consider our silence as an
 “ approbation of the opinions therein asserted, and already
 “ mentioned to have been condemned:

“ For these reasons, we have thought it expedient, without
 “ entertaining the said pretended appeal, which we declare to
 “ to be irregular, nugatory, and invalid, to take into conside-
 “ ration the reasons alledged by the said pretended appellant;
 “ and having examined the propositions hereafter set down, as

“ well separately taken, as compared with the context of the
 “ above-mentioned work of the said Pierre Louis Blanchard,
 “ We have unanimously agreed to the following resolutions :

“ *First*, We profess and teach, that Pius VII. the now
 “ Bishop of Rome, is the true and supreme Pastor of the Ca-
 “ tholic Church, that We adhere to him as the undoubted suc-
 “ cessor of Peter, and that he is fully and justly in possession
 “ of all spiritual powers, which, by reason of the Primacy di-
 “ vinely established in the Church of Christ, of right belong to
 “ the Chief Bishop of Christians, and to the Teacher of all
 “ Christians.

“ *Secondly*, We declare, that adhering, as We have done
 “ from the beginning, to the dogmatical decisions of Pius VI.
 “ of holy remembrance, concerning the so called *Civil Consti-*
 “ *tution of the Clergy of France*, and judging, after those de-
 “ cisions, that the said Constitution was impious in its sug-
 “ gestions, heretical in its pretensions, schismatical in several
 “ of its provisions, and on the whole to be rejected ; We judge
 “ at the same time, that our holy Father Pius VII. has not meant
 “ to approve, and by no colour or inference has he approved
 “ of the errors, heresies, or impious principles contained in
 “ the said *Civil Constitution of the Clergy*, or of any of them :
 “ but that, especially in his measures for the restoration of
 “ Catholic Unity, and the peaceful exercise of true religion in
 “ France, he has adhered to that, which was dogmatical in the
 “ said decisions of his predecessor, and that he has only yielded
 “ what the dreadful exigencies of the times demanded from a
 “ true Shepherd of the Christian Flock, in commiseration of
 “ *such days as had never appeared from the beginning of the*
 “ *world, and if they had not been shortened on account of the*
 “ *elect, all flesh would not have been saved.*

“ *Thirdly*, We declare, that in the Pontifical Acts already
 “ mentioned of Pius VII. he has validly, and agreeably to the
 “ spirit of the Sacred Canons, exerted the powers belonging to

“ the Apostolical See; that he has effectually restored the Ca-
 “ tholic Christians of France to the visible body of the Church,
 “ and that he has thereby imparted to them a true Communion
 “ with the Universal Church, that being restored to God thro’
 “ Christ, they may have remission of their sins in the Holy
 “ Spirit : And we accept, approve, and concur with the said
 “ acts of Pius VII. as good, rightful, authentic, and necessary,
 “ inspired by charity, and done in the faith of his predecessor.

“ As we are willing and prompt to make this declaration in
 “ testimony of the One Catholic Church. and in the defence of
 “ its visible Head, Pius VII. *for whose deliverance, as for-*
 “ *merly for that of Peter, the prayer of the Church is un-*
 “ *ceasingly offered up to God,* so it is with unfeigned grief we
 “ find ourselves compelled to reprehend the works or assertions
 “ of a man, who appears to have belonged to that glorious
 “ Church of France, which in these last days has crowned its
 “ Faith by Confession, and its Confession by Martyrdom ; in
 “ the sufferings of which We sorrowed, and for the deliverance
 “ of which We prayed : but being reduced to the necessity of
 “ either acting with pastoral authority and animadversion, or
 “ surrendering the sacred trust confided so us, We follow the
 “ example of him who has said : *If thy right eye scandalize*
 “ *thee, pluck it out and cast it forth from thee ; and again,*
 “ *unless a man hate his very soul, he cannot be my disciple.*

“ Wherefore, having seen the following propositions asserted
 “ by the said Pierre Louis Blanchard, and having examined
 “ them, we declare them respectively FALSE, CALUMNIOUS, and
 “ SCANDALOUS, inasmuch as they regard the acts of Pius VII.
 “ in his Restoration and Settlement of the Churches of France,
 “ and manifestly tending to schism, most dangerous at this time
 “ to the peace and unity of the Catholic Church, exciting and
 “ inviting to schism, not alone schismatical, but dogmatizing
 “ schism, usurping ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and subversive of
 “ Church authority.

“ The propositions are these following :

Page 38, “ L'Eglise du Concordat n'est pas Catholique.

Page 60, “ L' Hérésie vient d'obtenir en France un triomphe
“ complet, et Pie VII. en est la première et la principale
“ cause.

P. 95. “ Une Eglise aussi complètement asservie ne peut.
“ être l'Eglise de Jésus-Christ.

P. 99. “ Les Evêques Concordataires doivent être évités par
“ les fidèles jaloux d'opérer leur salut.

Ibid. “ Ils n'ont pas reçu de Jésus-Christ les pouvoirs
“ essentiellement libres dans leur principe et dans leur exercice.

P. 109. Un des sujets de leur justes plaintes (des Evêques
“ de France), c'est que Pie VII. par sa foiblesse, ait introduit
“ le schisme même et l'hérésie dans le sein de l'Eglise.

P. 134. “ Quant à ce Pape (Pius VII.) Je dis seulement
“ qu'il faut le denoncer a l'Eglise Catholique, encore sans
“ spécifier si c'est comme hérétique et schismatique, ou unique-
“ ment pour avoir violé les règles saintes.

P. 137. “ Pie VII. seroit hérétique et schismatique par
“ l'abandon et même par le mépris d'une decision solennelle de
“ l'Eglise :

“ This proposition separately taken is equivocal ; but it is to
“ be considered along with the three following :

P. 62. “ Nous avons donc dans la decision de Pie VI. con-
“ tre la Constitution civile du Clergé, celle de l'Eglise univer-
“ selle même.

P. 117. “ Pie VII. par la formation de l'Eglise Concor-
“ dataire a, en effet, révoqué les brefs de son prédécesseur,
“ et admis les principes fondamentaux de la *Constitution civile*
“ *du Clergé*.

Ibid. “ Comment Pie VII. a-t-il formé ce fantome d'Eglise ?
“ Il l'a formé sur les bases mêmes que Pie VI. avoit condam-
“ nées comme impies, hérétiques et schismatiques.

“ These Propositions we reject and condemn, without ap-
“ proving or intending to approve many other propositions
“ maintained by the said P. L. Blanchard as connected with the

“foregoing, and without entertaining, as We have already
 “declared, the said pretended appeal, or approving of it in
 “form or substance.

“In testimony of all which We, the aforesaid Archbishops
 “and Bishops have signed our names to this our Solemn Decla-
 “ration and Decision.”

“Dublin, 3d July, 1809.”

“Richard O'Reily, D. D.	J. T. Troy, D. D. Dublin.
Armagh.	Daniel Delany, D. D. Kildare
Thomas Bray, D. D. Chashell.	and Leighlin.
Francis Moylan, D. D. Cork.	James Lanigan, D. D. Ossory.
P. J. Plunket, D. D. Meath.	F. French, D. D. Elphin.
John Cruise, D. D. Ardagh.	T. Costello, D. D. Clonsfert.
John Power, D. D. Waterford and Lismore.	John Flyn, D. D. Elect, Achonry.
Flor. Mac Carthy, D. D. Antinoe. Coad. Cork.	Patrick Ryan, D. D. Germanicia, Coad. Ferns.
E. Dillon, D. D. Tuam.	Daniel Murray, D. D. Coad.
J. Caulfield, D. D. Ferns.	Elect, Dublin.”

“I hereby certify that the underwritten Prelates, not pre-
 “sent at the assembly of their brethren on the 3d of July,
 “have approved the foregoing solemn Declaration and Deci-
 “sion; and authorized me by their respective letters, to affix
 “their signatures thereto.”

“J. T. TROY, D. D. Dublin.”

“August 21, 1809.”

“Wm. Coppinger, D. D.	C. Sughrue, D. D. Kerry.
Cloyne and Ross.	James Murphy, D. D. Clogher.
P. Mac Mullen, D. D. Down and Connor.	J. O'Shaughnessy, D. D. Kilalloe.
E. Derry, D. D. Dromore.	P. Mac Loughlin, D. D. Raphoe.
Chas. O'Donnell, D. D. Derry.	F. Reilly, D. D. Kilmore.
N. J. Archdeacon, D. D. Kilmacduagh and Kilfenora.	Val. Bodkin, D. D. Ward, Galway.”
Dominick Bellew, D. D. Kilalla.	

No. VII.

Doctor Charles O'Connor's different professions of submission to Papal authority in Latin and English.

“There are, who insinuate that I am an enemy to the just rights of the holy See. In reply to that calumny, I beg leave to enter this solemn protest, which may be seen translated into English at the conclusion of this letter.” (Advertisement to Columbanus' third letter on the liberties of the Irish Church, &c.)

For the conveniency of my readers, and the more ready discovery of Columbanus' fidelity of translation, and marvellous adaptation of his professions to the taste, fashion, spirit, views, and interest of his readers, countenancers, abettors, and employers, I shall draw his Roman and British protest into closer contact, in order that the variations of this *formula bilinguis* may more glaringly appear. “A figure with two faces: one turned to the treasury, and the other turned to the people, with a double tongue speaking contradictory language.” (Antea 17.)

Protestor imprimis me sedem Petri Apostolicam, ut cæterarum caput, sincero prosequi honore: nec unquam me vel latum unguem a <i>debitâ</i> ipsi obedientiâ <i>canonica</i> recessurum. Tantum autem abest ut putem hæc mea opuscula quidquam ejus legitimæ auctoritati officere, ut é contra existimem, ad animos Ecclesiæ Romanæ conciliandos esse valde necessaria, cum cathedræ Petri primatus et divina, quâ pollet auctoritas sincerè agnosci ne-	I protest most solemnly, that I entertain the most sincere respect for the Apostolic See, as the head of all: and that I never will depart one inch from the canonical obedience, which is due to that See. But I am far from thinking that the principles inculcated in my publications, can be prejudicial to the <i>legitimate</i> authority of that See or of our Bishops. I believe on the contrary, that they are absolutely necessary to conciliate the minds of men to the
---	---

queat, nisi intra justos limites
cohibeatur.

Pessimè quidem de sede apostolicâ merentur, qui auctoritatem ejus nimium extollentes, eam Regibus timendam, populis invidiosam Ecclesiarum omnium libertatibus formidandam ostentant. Optimè vero ii, qui Sancti Petri legitimum jus ad unitatem Ecclesiæ visibilem firmandam institutum solidis rationibus a mundanâ & adulterinâ, quæ ipsi immerito tribuitur, potestate secernunt.

As in professions and formularies of faith, the most punctilious nicety both of language and intention is required, the reader will not think it an effort of fastidious criticism, if I remark, that the Latin words *cæterarum caput*, as they stand in the context, convey a very different meaning from the English words *as the head of all*. These English words to me appear to bear the meaning of mere primacy, as Columbanus seems throughout his *opuscula*, as he here denominates

true privileges of the episcopal order: since the primacy of the holy See can never be acknowledged in the British Islands, unless it is restrained within its just limits, and recalled to its original institution.

Surely they are evil counsellors, and deserve no favour from that See, who extending its power beyond those limits which God has imposed, render it dreadful to all States, odious to all people, formidable to the liberties of all national churches, despotic in its decrees! But they deserve well of the holy See, who distinguish its legitimate privileges, instituted for the sacred purpose of preserving the *Unity of the Christian Church*, from that worldly and spurious pomp of power, which flatterers and sycophants have in vain endeavoured to establish.

his writings, to incline strongly to the doctrine of the Pope's merely ranking as first Bishop, *primus inter pares*, the first amongst his equals. As Armagh ranks first amongst the four Irish metropolitans. Whereas the orthodox meaning or import of the Latin words *cæterarum caput* as they stand, I humbly take to be, that the holy see of Rome is the head, origin and source of all other sees throughout the church; that is, they were created or formed, and are continually supported by receiving apostolic mission successively from the see of Rome. Thus we before observed, was the new hierarchy or province of Baltimore, in North America, created or formed by his present Holiness Pope Pius VII. No other prelate or prelates on earth, without power emanating from the see of Rome, could have produced such an effect. Notwithstanding the hallucinating Doctor frequently boasts of Bishops having been formerly named, made, consecrated, appointed, confirmed, instituted, invested, installed, &c. without the privity, consent, approbation, or co-operation of the see of Rome, and that the Irish Church was once governed and administered *independently* of the holy see. As well might he argue, that the Irish Viceroy appoints to civil places or situations in Ireland *independently* of the crown, because no immediate act passes between the sovereign and the appointee.

The English reading of the second section of this *protest*, as Columbanus rather singularly terms a professed act of submission to a legitimate superior, is a most brazen attempt to impose upon the ignorance or stupidity of all, to whom the English language is familiar. It bears the badge of rankling fraud. It entirely suppresses the whole doctrinal substance, the very quintessence and ground of Roman Catholic faith in the spiritual kingdom of Christ, and every word, that can import, or even suggest an idea of that basis of Catholic submission to papal supremacy: viz. *et divina qua pollet auctoritas*, that is, *and the divine authority, on which it rests*. The rest of the sentence is so seasoned and garnished, in order to suit it to

the British palate, that it is completely disguised by the introduction of the following novelties, which are not discoverable in the genuine original words of the supposed text in Latin : viz. *principles inculcated in my publications*, for *hæc mea opuscula: or of our Bishops*, is a pure voluntary, not warranted by a single syllable of any such import in the Latin. No man would suppose, that the words *the true privileges of the Episcopal order* were intended to convey the meaning of *Ecclesiæ Romanæ*. The particularizing the British Islands, as the *locus in quo* a conditional acknowledgment of the primacy of the holy see is to be admitted, under qualification and reform, is glaringly an obtrusive periphrasis upon the Roman text ; not to explain the import of it in the English language, but to flatter the religious prejudices of the church of England, as by law established. Although it may be pleonasm to most, it may yet be of utility and satisfaction to some of my readers, who from their ignorance of the learned language, may still be incredulous, that any man of the most ordinary pretensions to credit or decency in life should attempt to practice such barefaced deception, that I give a literal translation of this second sentence into English : and I will add *a la Columbanus*, compare, compare. “ But so far am I from thinking, that these little
“ works of mine are at all hurtful to it’s legitimate authority,
“ that on the contrary I deem them very necessary to reconcile
“ the minds of men to the Roman Church, as the primacy of
“ the Chair of Peter, and the divine authority, upon which it
“ rests, cannot be sincerely acknowledged, unless it be restrain-
“ ed within it’s just bounds.”

A like literal version of the two remaining sentences, will enable the reader, who happens to be ignorant of the dead language, to judge of Columbanian honesty, by comparison of his own *formula bilinguis*, his *two-tongued* profession.—
“ But those indeed deserve very ill of the Apostolic See, who
“ extolling it’s authority too much, hold it forth as dreadful to
“ kings, odious to the people, and formidable to the liberties
“ of all churches. But they deserve well of it, who with solid

“ reason discriminate the legitimate right of St. Peter, insti-
 “ tuted for strengthening the visible unity of the Church from
 “ that worldly and spurious power, which is attributed to it.”

A very great fool is he,

Who translates literally. (ANTEA, 205.)

No. VIII.

A Letter from the Arch-Bishop of Baltimore and his suffragan Bishops in the United States of North America, to the Arch-Bishops and Bishops of Ireland, faithfully translated from the original Latin.

N. B. It was written in answer and consequence of an Encyclical Letter from the Arch-Bishops and Bishops of Ireland to all the Catholic Prelates throughout the World, an English Translation of which is to be seen in the Appendix No, IV. to my History of Ireland since the Union, Vol. III.



TO THE MOST ILLUSTRIOUS AND REVEREND L. L. THE
 ARCH-BISHOPS AND BISHOPS IN IRELAND.

The Arch-Bishops and Bishops appointed in the United States of America.

HEALTH IN THE LORD.

WE received, venerable brethren, with a sense of gratitude and with that reverence, which is deservedly due to you, the letter which your charity indited to all the Prelates of the Catholic church, on the 3d calends of March.

It has been determined by us, with the help of God, to cherish the unity of Christ's church and the authority of the holy See, upon which the said unity depends, and to defend and assert the primacy of honor and jurisdiction, which the Sovereign Pontiff possesses by divine right. We deem it a duty equally sacred as gratifying to profess unreserved fidelity and obedience to him, who now holds the supremacy of the Ponti-

ificate, Pius VII. To this Pontiff, who never can be sufficiently praised, we adhere and submit, as members to the head. But since, as we have it out of St. Paul, *if one member suffer, all the members suffer with it*; how much more ought not the grievous sufferings of the head itself to raise the most painful sensations in all the members.

With you, ven rable brethren, we lament and are indignant before the Lord, with you do we pronounce it an unutterable crime, that an *old man should be turned out of his home, his country, an unoffending Bishop should be afflicted, that the Mother Church should be stripped of her patrimony, and a well-deserving Pontiff should be harrassed with calumnies.* Of us, situated in this remote country, Pope Pius VII. has been most highly deserving, as we confess with every sense of gratitude. We owe it to his provident and apostolical piety, that this portion of the Lord's flock in the United States of America has been formed into an Ecclesiastical Province, consisting of the Arch-Bishop of Baltimore and four suffragan Bishops.

We trusted in the Lord, that the same eminent strength of mind, which so gloriously shone forth in Pius VI. of happy memory, we should always find conspicuous in Pius VII. And we doubt not, but that he will to the last continue to exhibit that invincible constancy of mind, which he has already made appear in suffering calamities for the solace of the Church, wherever he shall be called upon to act, speak, or (perhaps) suffer for it.

In the mean time we profess before God, that we will humbly listen to the admonitions of our most Holy Father, although detained in captivity, and that we will promptly obey his wishes and commands, if they carry on the face of them the due marks of the sincere words of Peter, and of the genuine mind and authority of his Holiness. We shall however consider ourselves bounden by no letters or documents of any nature whatsoever as issuing from him, which may be handed about in his name, unless all or even the slightest shade of suspicion shall

have been first removed, that Pius VII. did not enjoy full and perfect freedom of deliberation and consultation.

But if the Sovereign Pontiff should depart out of this life (which in such great perils of the Church may God avert) we are equally persuaded with you, venerable brethren, that Almighty God will not be in the least wanting to his Church in such affliction; which, although for a length of time she have been in a state of widowhood, deprived of a Sovereign Pastor on earth, she will nevertheless incur less detriment, than if any one attempted by force and terror to mount the chair of Peter, and rend the mystical body of Christ, by a fatal Schism. Whence we have so made up our minds, that we shall endeavour to persuade the people committed to our care, to acknowledge no one as the true and undoubted successor of St. Peter, whom a decided majority of the Bishops of the whole world shall not have acknowledged.

If we, Reverend brethren, who as yet scarcely bear a name amidst the diffused Churches, have resolved to convey to you these sentiments of our mind, it was your humanity, that encouraged us to do it, moved by which you vouchsafed to address your Encyclical Letter to the other Prelates of the Catholic World, and even unto us. It would be unpardonable not to answer this honorable attention to us. For you fill those Apostolical Sees, which for a long series of years have been rendered illustrious by the holy Prelates your predecessors. You confirm the people committed to your charge in the ancient and sincere faith, and with piety in word and deed, and you exhibit the singular, perhaps solitary example, of invincible fortitude in supporting and propagating the Catholic doctrine, in resistance and defiance of all human artifice, fraud and violence.

We beg to be humbly recommended to your prayers, and we earnestly implore for you every prosperity to your country, to your churches, and to each of you individually.

Fare ye well, most illustrious and reverend Prelates.

Baltimore, 14th day of November, 1810.

+ JOHN, *Arch-Bishop of Baltimore.*

+ LEONARD, *Bishop of Gorta, Coadjutor to the Arch-Bishop of Baltimore.*

+ F. MICHAEL, *Bishop of Philadelphia.*

+ JOHN, *Bishop of Boston.*

+ BENEDICT JOSEPH, *Bishop of Bardstown.*

The following documents shew how widely the Catholic Bishops in North America differ in their opinions, feelings and conduct concerning his Holiness Pope Pius VII. from Columbanus, who inveighs with such bitterness and rancour against the Irish Hierarchy and Doctor Milner, for censuring Blanchard and others of that schismatical cast; some of whom still find advocates, supporters and abettors, to the great mischief and scandal of the true Catholic flocks, in those districts, where they are actually receiving that countenance and encouragement, which encreases and spreads the evil.

“We, the undersigned, by divine permission, and with the approbation of the Holy See, Arch-Bishop and Bishops of our respective dioceses, to our beloved Brethren. Grace and Peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ.

The many outrages committed against the person of our Chief Pastor Pius VII. the Vicar of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the government of his Church, and the invasion of the patrimony of the Holy See, have been long known to you, our beloved Brethren, and excited in your breasts, sentiments of deep affliction and indignation. These acts of aggression were not only unprovoked; but to avert them, our holy Father employed all means of forbearance, meekness, patience, admonition, charitable remonstrances, and even condescension, as far as his conscience and duty would allow him, and thus evincing his sincere desire to preserve peace, unity, and true religion

in the whole flock committed to his charge. But fruitless were his endeavours to restrain violence, and infuse principles of justice. The work of oppression went on to it's consummation in defiance of all law natural and divine. After suffering with that placid constancy, which only the God of fortitude could inspire, the disrespectful and insulting treatment, and being stripped of the dominions, which had been held by his predecessors for more than a thousand years to the immense benefit of the Christian world, he was first made a prisoner within the walls of his own palace, and then, as was his immediate and holy predecessor of blessed memory, Pius VI. forcibly dragged away from the chair of St Peter, and the sacred ashes of the apostles, he is detained in a foreign land as a prisoner, and debarred from communicating with any part of the flock committed to his pastoral care and solicitude. Thus has divine Providence permitted him to drink of that cup, and share in those sufferings, of which the first of his predecessors, St. Peter, and many after him had so large a portion, to the end, that their constancy in resisting the impiety of the enemies of Jesus Christ might be as conspicuous as their high rank in the church of God, and that their public testimony for the honor of his sacred person and religion might confound, and leave without excuse the malevolence or ignorance of those men, who continued to calumniate the Bishops of Rome, as corrupters of the faith and worship of God the Father and his blessed Son, the Saviour of mankind, for whose sake so many of them sacrificed their liberty and their lives.

But though the church is glorified by their meritorious sufferings, it is not less the duty of all it's members, during the oppression of our common Father, to offer up our fervent prayers for his deliverance from the power of his enemies, that he may freely and efficaciously exercise, for the advantage of our souls, his important pastoral duties. When St. Peter, prince of the apostles, was cast into prison by the impious Herod, and loaded with chains, the primitive Christians regarded it as

a common calamity, and prayer was made without ceasing by the church to God for him. Acts, ch. 12. v. 5.

Their prayers were graciously heard, and an angel of the Lord stood by him, and the chains fell off from his hands. v. 7.

Encouraged by their example and success, let us beseech the Almighty Founder, preserver and continual protector of his church to manifest his power in these our days, as heretofore, by delivering our chief pastor out of the hands of his enemies, and restoring peace and tranquillity, so that he and other pastors under him may again every where, and in all freedom, minister to their respective flocks in all holy things. To render our prayers acceptable before God, they must proceed from penitential hearts, deeply humiliated by a sense of their past transgressions, fully resolved to follow no more their sinful lusts and disorderly affections, and filled with an assurance of obtaining mercy and favour through the merits of our Saviour Jesus Christ.

Wherefore, on every Sunday or festival, either immediately before Mass or Sermon, the respective pastors shall recite the 120th Psalm with the prayer hereto annexed: and all priests, at the daily celebration of Mass, besides the proper collect, shall add that for the Pope, as in the missal, *Deus omnium fidelium pastor and rector*, &c. These directions are to be observed till further notice. May the Grace of God, through Jesus Christ, and that peace, which the world cannot give, remain always with you.

Baltimore, November 15, 1810.

† JOHN, *Arch-Bishop of Baltimore.*

† MICHAEL, *Bishop of Philadelphia.*

† JOHN, *Bishop of Boston.*

† BENEDICT JOSEPH, *Bishop of Bardstown.*

PSALM 120.

I have lifted up my eyes to the mountains, from whence help shall come to me.

My hold is from the Lord, who made Heaven and Earth.

May he not suffer thy foot to be moved! neither let him slumber, who keepeth thee.

Behold, he shall neither slumber nor sleep, who keepeth Israel.

The Lord is thy keeper: the Lord is thy protection upon thy right hand.

The Sun shall not burn thee by day, nor the Moon by night.

The Lord keepeth thee from evil: may the Lord keep thy soul.

May the Lord keep thy coming in, and thy going out, from henceforth now and for ever.

Glory be to the Father, &c.

As it was in the beginning, &c.

V. Let us pray for our chief Bishop Pius.

R. Our Lord preserve him, and give him life, and make him blessed on earth, and deliver him not to the will of his enemies.

V. O Lord hear my prayer.

R. And let my supplication come unto thee.

V. The Lord be with you.

R. And with thy spirit.

LET US PRAY.

O God, the pastor and governor of all the faithful, look down in thy mercy on thy servant Pius, whom thou hast appointed to be Pastor over the church: grant, we beseech thee, that both by word and example, he may be profitable to those, over whom he presides, that together with the flock entrusted to him, he may obtain everlasting life, through Jesus our Lord. Amen.

*Extract of a letter from the most Rev. Doctor Carroll,
Arch-Bishop of Baltimore, to the most Rev. Doctor Troy,
Arch-Bishop of Dublin: dated 26th Nov. 1810.*

“ Agreeable to your Lordship’s desire, I delivered a copy of the printed letter of the most Rev. Arch-Bishops and Bishops of Ireland to my Coadjutor, and the Bishops of Philadelphia, Boston and Bardstown, Kentucky; and we perused it with all the veneration due to those eminent prelates, who now constitute, perhaps, the fairest hope and strongest bulwark of the church throughout the Christian world: for you enjoy, through divine mercy, the privilege of openly declaring the genuine sentiments, which may animate and enlighten not only the pastors, but likewise all members of the Catholic Church. To make the communication to my Rev. Brethren, I availed myself of the circumstance of their being all brought together at this place to receive their consecration on the 28th Oct. 1st and 4th of this month.

The consecrations being done, the Bishops remained two entire weeks with me, to advise on many points of regulation and discipline, that we may follow an uniform practice in the government of our Churches: and likewise to take into consideration the present state of the Catholic Church, of it’s visible head, our venerable Pontiff, and the consequences of his being withdrawn from his captivity either by violence, or the ruin of his constitution by interior or exterior sufferings. In these discussions the encyclical letter from your Most and Right Rev. Lordships necessarily offered itself to our minds, and though we know not whether the Vicars Apostolic in England, or the Bishops in any other country have expressed themselves as a body, on the obedience due to any acts emanating ostensibly from the Pope, or on the caution to be used in recognizing his successor: Yet we judge it our duty to transmit you an answer, which I have the honor to enclose. We were too sensible of our insufficiency, and recent dates of our establishment, to prescribe to ourselves, or profess before the venerable

Fathers of the church an adhesion to specific rules of conduct in all the most intricate situations, which may happen: humbly trusting, that if the exigency should arise, we shall be directed by that divine spirit, which is promised to the Pastors, successors of the Apostles. We therefore pledged ourselves to those general principles, which are now indispensable and essential: not doubting, but your determination and luminous examples, will, under God, be our direction in the disastrous times and events so likely to ensue."

Extract of a Letter from the Right Rev. J. O. Plessis,
Bishop of Quebec, to the Most Rev Doctor Troy, translated
from the French. Quebec, 5th Nov. 1810.*

"I had the honor of receiving in last September, your Grace's letter of the 28th of May and 5th of June. The judgment of the Irish Bishops against Blanchard has not yet appeared here, I propose to procure them from Keating & Co. as well as the other publications relating to the discussion, which he has raised.

* The name of this respectable Prelate brings to mind the circumstances of his appointment to the See of Quebec. They have been narrated to me by persons so worthy of credit, that I profess fully to believe them: at the same time I candidly avow, I have no historical document to offer for vouching for the particulars. Were it even a supposed case, it would furnish as practical an elucidation of what a *Veto* would be, if once vested in the government, as true. There died at Bruxelles, about twenty years ago, a Franciscan Friar of the name of *Kildea*. He was from the North of Ireland: was a man of talent and information, a handsome person, of pleasing address and engaging manners. Whilst at Prague, where there was an Irish establishment of his order, he became acquainted with many of his countrymen, officers in the German service. He was sure to captivate all his acquaintance; and whether by external recommendation and favor, or by the internal sympathy and esteem of his community, he was appointed guardian of

Nothing, my Lord, conduces more to the honor of the Irish clergy, than the firmness, with which you have rejected the *Veto*, which would go to ruin the discipline of your respectable church.

If this packet should go by Newfoundland, I will take the liberty of encreasing it, by adding to it my pastoral, which I have just published respecting the detention of our Holy Father the Pope. Every body here has read with interest the resolutions entered into in February last, by the clergy of Ireland, relative to his Holiness."

that Convent much earlier in life than is usual to name superiors of religious houses. He obtained the licence of his superiors to come over to the English Mission. In traversing Germany he wanted not recommendations; amongst other places, where he was honourably and gladly received was the Court of Prince Meclingburgh Strelitz, who gave him letters of very warm recommendation to his Sister, our Queen. On his arrival in London he handed them over to Lord Sydney, then Secretary of State; and was, on the next day, honoured with an audience of her Majesty, who received him with the most gracious affability, but frankly declared her inability to second the warm wishes of her Brother to a person of his cloath in England; but offered to procure for him strong recommendations to some ambassador at the Court of London, in whose retinue he might return to the continent, and be sure of Ecclesiastical preferment in the state of that ambassador's Sovereign. Father Kildea replied, that he wished to follow up his vocation, by rendering service to his Majesty's subjects. He was told, that prejudices against popery ran so high, that it would be less prudent for his Majesty, however inclined to grant him a private audience. He frequently waited upon, and was always favourably received by Lord Sydney. From want of any better provision he was named Chaplain to the Portuguese Ambassador in South-Street. He had not long done duty in that situation, when the report of the death of the Catholic Bishop of Quebec carried him to his friend Lord Sydney, who gave him every encouragement to hope for the nomination to that vacant See. This was, according to Columbanus, an *honest exertion* without intrigue. Father Kildea, who was naturally convivial, and never very reserved, did not conceal his expectations from his friends. It came to the knowledge of Dr. Hussey, the late Catholic Bishop of Waterford, who had long been in the confidential intimacy of Lord Sydney. He represented to his Lordship, that, with-

TRANSLATED FROM AN AUTHENTICATED COPY IN FRENCH.

“ Pastoral of my Lord Bishop of Quebec, for public prayers.

JOSEPH OCTAVE PLESSIS,

By the mercy of God, and the grace of the holy apostolical See, Bishop of Quebec, &c. &c. to the clergy and faithful of our diocese, health and benediction.

“ The last letters, which we have received from Europe, confirming the reports frequently repeated in the public newspapers, leave no room for doubting about the captivity of our Holy Father the Pope, in the fortress of Savona, in Italy.

It is after having been unjustly and ignominiously despoiled of his estates, separated, notwithstanding his protestations, from the college of Cardinals and his most confidential servants: after having seen taken from him, under his own eyes, the

out derogating from the amiable character of his friend Father Kildea, he seriously submitted to the consideration of his Majesty's Government, that upon the first vacancy of a Catholic Bishoprick, to which any temporalities were annexed, and the nomination or recommendation to which naturally therefore devolved on the Crown, it would be wise and political to be very choice in the nomination, and to shew every tender regard to the wishes, habits, and principles of his Majesty's new Catholic Canadian subjects: that amongst the many amiable and valuable attainments of Father Kildea, the episcopal qualifications described by St. Paul, were not the most prominent. Lord Sydney attended to the advice of Doctor Hussey, and a person of the country respectable for his edifying conduct, knowledge, and evangelical zeal, was recommended by his Majesty, and the above prelate was thereupon confirmed by the Pope. Lord Sydney, who loved a joke, after having allowed, that he was really fond of Father Kildea, and had given him encouragement, laughed and said, he thought he had been doing a good-natured thing to all parties: for he did not doubt, but that Father Kildea, if appointed, would soon have a nursery, and then the See would become hereditary, and they would be eased of any further importunity or trouble about future nominations.

archives of the Roman church, and having for a long time wandered from town to town, that the sovereign Pontiff is at last sent back, at least since the last nine months, to this prison, without any human comfort, deprived, as we are assured, even of the attendance of his servants, and reduced to the same rations with the other prisoners of every description, who participate of his misery.

Who, my dearly beloved brethren, could have brought upon the head of the church, a treatment of this sort? Has he betrayed the interests of religion? Has he abused the authority, which as a sovereign prince he had over his own subjects? or as the first pastor over the faithful? Has he been in the least wanting in any deference and compliance, which Christian princes might expect at his hands? Alas! you know it. His great piety, his moderation, his mildness, his condescension strongly repel any such injurious surmise. He is persecuted for his justice: and there my dearly beloved brethren, is what ought to console us, at the view of the sufferings he undergoes.

No man is ignorant of the sacrifices, which this worthy Vicar of Jesus Christ has made, to bring back into the fold the sheep, which the French revolution had driven astray. He negotiated with the French government, the very moment he fancied he could perceive a hope of re-establishing the ancient worship of a nation heretofore so dear unto the Church. He sent into France a *Legato a latere* to settle and arrange the principal provisions of the Concordat of 1801. Thither he repaired two years after in person, braving all human dangers and terrors, and appeared in the midst of the unbelievers, who composed the court of the new Monarch, like a lamb in the midst of wolves, having no other policy, than the simplicity of the gospel, stopping the mouths of the most unbridled impious by his meekness and extraordinary modesty, and forcing the apostates themselves to do homage to his eminent virtues.

However grateful the head of the French government ought to have been for such a journey without a precedent for several

centuries, undertaken at his request, and in part for his interest, he only repaid this paternal condescension of the Sovereign Pontiff with ingratitude and cruelty. Scarcely was he returned to Italy, than he pretended to compel him, not only to shut the ports of his states against all the vessels belonging to the enemies of France, but even to declare open hostility to all nations, with which France should think fit to make war. The just horror of the common Father of all the Faithful at such a proposition, and his peremptory refusal to accede to it, was the pretext, which the ambitious conqueror made use of to rifle him without mercy, and without any respect for his dignity, which he could not disclaim, though he sought to debase it. The perfidious hand, which had just been overturning the thrones of Naples and Etruria, and was preparing to do the same by those of Spain and Portugal, has dared by a sacrilegious attempt to raise himself also against the chair of St. Peter. The Pope has been stricken out of the list of sovereign princes: his dominions seized upon: his person insulted and proscribed. My dearly beloved brethren, the innocence of the just is the torment of the wicked, because it silently reproaches them with their excesses. Let us not wonder, that they seek to oppress and get rid of him. *Circumveniamus justum, quoniam contrarius est operibus nostris, & impropere nobis peccata.* (Sap. 2. 12.)

True it is, that the overthrowing of the temporal power of the Pope in no manner affects his authority, as head of the universal church: that the apostolical See is not the work of man: and consequently that man cannot destroy it: that its divine Founder established it upon a solid rock: (Mat. 16, 18) that the sovereign pontificate, being the centre of Catholic unity, will last as long as the church, that is to say, to the consummation of ages: (Mat. 28, 20) in short, that the persecution, which the vicar of Christ suffers in the present moment, his captivity, his sufferings, even his death, should they end in that, far from being in itself a real evil, are, on the contrary, a mark

of God's predilection for him, the reward of his merit, a source of spiritual joy, as it was to the apostles to suffer outrages for the name of Jesus. *Ibant gaudentes a conspectu concilii, quoniam digni habiti sunt pro nomine Jesu contumeliam pati.* (Act. 12. 5.)

Nevertheless, the storms, which from time to time agitate the church, the persecutions, to which she is a prey, the ill-treatment of her pastors have always appeared objects worthy of her attention, her tears, and prayers. Peter was in prison, the acts of the apostles tell us, *Petrus quidem servabatur in carcere*, and the church prayed to God incessantly for him. *Oratio autem fiebat sine intermissione ab ecclesiâ ad Deum pro eo.*

Thus, although by the special protection of heaven, we be in this part of the world, sheltered from the scourges, which elsewhere overwhelm the church of Jesus Christ: although by the liberality and sound policy of the Government, under which Providence has placed us, the holy religion we profess enjoys in this happy country, all the respect and external pomp, which we can reasonably expect; we must not therefore feel less interest in the sufferings of our absent brethren, and above all, in those of the successor of St. Peter, and we should not be worthy of belonging to the church, of which he is the first pastor, if, when apprized of his confinement and anguish, we deferred any longer to offer up to heaven our vows and prayers to obtain his deliverance.

For these reasons we have regulated and ordained, and by these presents we do regulate and ordain what follows.

1st. In all the churches and chapels of our diocese, wherever mass is publicly celebrated, on every Sunday and holyday of obligation, immediately after the parochial, conventual, or principal mass, the priest, who shall have celebrated it, shall not quit the altar step without having on his knees, in a loud voice recited, and the congregation answering, either seven times *Pater Noster* and seven times *Ave Maria*, or the *Litany*

of the blessed Virgin for the pressing necessities of the church, and especially for the deliverance of our Holy Father Pope Pius VII. actually detained a prisoner. We hope, that such of the faithful as shall not be able to attend divine service, will say the same prayers in their families.

2d. Every Priest shall add to his mass, to the same intention, the prayer for the Pope, *Deus omnium fidelium* every time that it shall not be specially indicated, and that the mass of the day shall not be of the first class.

3d. These prayers shall be continued until it shall be notified to the clergy by our letters, or on our part, by those of our Vicars General, that the time is come to interrupt them.

This present pastoral shall be published at the Exhortations of all the parishes, the first Sunday or festival after it shall have been received, and read in the assembly or chapter of all communities.

*Given at Quebec, under our Signature and Seal,
and the Counterseal of our Secretary, the
25th of October, 1810.*

+ J. O. EV. DE QUEBEC.

L. — S.

By my Lord,

P. FLAV. TURGEON, Prt. Sec.

TRUE COPY,

P. F. TURGEON, Prt. Sec.

P

No. IX.

The Irish Remonstrance, signed by PETER WALSH, and twenty-two other Regulars, in 1666.

FROM WALSH'S HISTORY OF THE REMONSTRANCE, p. 7, 8, and 9.

“TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

The humble Remonstrance, Acknowledgment, Protestation, and Petition of the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland.

Your Majesty's faithful subjects, the Roman Catholic Clergy of your Majesty's Kingdom of Ireland, do most humbly represent this their present state and deplorable condition.

That being entrusted by the indispensable commission of the King of kings, with the care of souls, and the care of their flocks, in order to the administration of *Sacraments*, and teaching the people that perfect obedience, which, for conscience sake, they are bound to pay to your Majesty's commands, they are laden with calumnies, and persecuted with severity.

That being obliged by the allegiance, they owe and ought to swear unto your Majesty, to reveal all conspiracies and practices against your person and royal authority, that come to their knowledge, they are themselves clamoured against, as conspirators plotting the destruction of the English among them, without any ground, that may give the least colour to so foul a crime, to pass for probable, in the judgment of any indifferent person.

That their crimes are as numerous and divers, as are the inventions of their adversaries: and because they cannot with freedom appear to justify their innocency, all the fictions and allegations against them are received as undoubted verities, and which is yet more mischievous, the laity, upon whose consciences the character of priesthood gives them an influence, suffer under all the crimes thus falsely imputed to

them: it being their adversaries' principal design, that the Irish, whose estates they enjoy, should be reputed persons unfit, and no way worthy any title to your Majesty's mercy.

That no wood comes amiss to make arrows for their destruction: for as if the Roman Catholic Clergy, whom they esteem most criminal, were or ought to be a society so perfect, as no evil, no indiscreet person should be found amongst them, they are all of them generally cried down, for any crime, true or feigned, which is imputed to one of them; and as if no word could be spoken, no letter written but with the common consent of all of them, the whole Clergy must suffer for that, which is laid to the charge of any particular person among them.

We know what *odium* all the Catholic Clergy lies under, by reason of the calumnies, with which our tenets in religion, and our dependence on the Pope's authority, are aspersed; and we humbly beg your Majesty's pardon to vindicate both, by the ensuing protestation, which we make in sight of heaven, and in the presence of your Majesty, sincerely and truly, without equivocation or mental reservation.

We do acknowledge and confess your Majesty to be our true and lawful king, supreme lord, and rightful sovereign of Ireland, and of all other your Majesty's dominions: and therefore we acknowledge and confess ourselves to be obliged, under pain of sin, to obey your Majesty in all civil and temporal affairs, as much as any other of your Majesty's subjects, and as the laws and rules of Government in this kingdom do require at our hands; and that notwithstanding any power or pretension of the Pope or See of Rome, or any sentence or declaration of what kind or quality soever, given or to be given by the Pope, his predecessors or successors, or by any authority, spiritual or temporal, proceeding or derived from him, or his See, against your Majesty or royal authority, we will still acknowledge and perform to the utmost of our abilities our faithful loyalty and true allegiance

to your Majesty. And we openly disclaim and renounce all foreign power, be it papal or princely, spiritual or temporal, in as much as it may seem able, or shall pretend to free, discharge, or absolve us from this obligation, or shall any way give us leave or licence to raise tumults, bear arms, or offer any violence to your Majesty's person, royal authority, or to the State or Government. Being all of us ready, not only to discover and make known to your Majesty and to your Ministers all the treasons made against your Majesty or them, which shall come to our hearing; but also to loose our lives in defence of your Majesty's person and royal authority, and to resist with our best endeavours all conspiracies and attempts against your Majesty, be they framed or sent under what pretence, or patronized by what foreign power or authority soever. And further, we profess, that all absolute princes and supream governors of what religion soever they be, are God's lieutenants on earth, and that obedience is due to them according to the laws of each commonwealth respectively in all civil and temporal affairs. And therefore we here do protest against all doctrine and authority to the contrary. And we do hold it impious and against the word of God, to maintain, that any private subject may kill or murder the anointed of God, his prince, though of a different belief and religion from his. And we abhor and detest the practice thereof, as damnable and wicked.

These being the tenets of our religion, in point of loyalty and submission to your Majesty's commands, and our dependence of the See of Rome, no way entrenching upon that perfect obedience, which, by our birth, by all laws, divine and humane, we are bound to pay to your Majesty, our natural and lawful Sovereign. We humbly beg, prostrate at your Majesty's feet, that you would be pleased to protect us from the severe persecution we suffer, merely from our profession in religion; leaving those that are, or hereafter shall be guilty of other crimes (and there have been such in all times, as well by their pens, as by their actions) to the punishment prescribed by the law.

No. X.

A PAPAL BULL,

*Appointing a Coadjutor to an Irish Bishop;*FAITHFULLY TRANSLATED FROM THE LATIN ORIGINAL IN THE AUTHOR'S
POSSESSION.

CLEMENT, P. P. XIV.

Beloved Son; Health and Apostolical Benediction.

The Roman Pontiff being invested by the heavenly pastor with a plenitude of power for the government and wholesome regulation of all churches, particularly cathedrals, and applying night and day to the discharge of his office, diligently provides whatever tends to preserve and forward them, as circumstances call for, and at the same time as the condition of the times and situations permits, looking not only to the present, but also to the future state of affairs, in order, that those churches may, as far as may be preserved from blemish, and thrive with the blessing of the Lord by continual encrease both spiritual and temporal. Since therefore, our venerable Brother Peter Crew, Bishop of the for ever canonically united churches of Waterford and Lismore, in the kingdom of Ireland, on account of his encreasing age, and the bodily infirmities under which he labours, as we are informed, and as he himself acknowledges, is unfit, henceforth, personally to perform the functions of his pastoral office, and of the government and administration of the aforesaid churches committed to his charge. We therefore, lest in the mean while, by means of the impediments of the aforesaid Bishop Peter, the said churches should be exposed to any spiritual or temporal inconveniences, wishing from our paternal care to provide, after the diligent deliberation, which we have thereupon had with our venerable Brethren the Cardinals of the holy Roman Church, who preside over the concerns for the propagation of the faith, have at last fixed

the eyes of our mind upon you*, being a secular priest of legitimate age, born in lawful wedlock, and having all other necessary requisites, concerning whom testimonials worthy of all belief are lying before us, as to the purity of your life, the correctness of your morals, your attention to spiritual and circumspection in temporal concerns, and to your being gifted with many other virtues. To all which things, we having given due consideration, fully absolving and holding you absolved from excommunications, suspensions and interdicts, and from all other ecclesiastical sentences passed either by the law, or upon any examination upon any occasion or cause whatsoever, if in any such you happen to be implicated, in order only, however, to give full effect to these presents: we will have you expressly, by these presents, to be named to the church of Sura, which is in parts inhabited by infidels, now destitute of the consolation of a Pastor; of your person well received by us and our said brethren on the claim of your deserts, with the advice of our said brethren, by our apostolic authority, we do provide, and we do institute you to be it's bishop, by committing fully to you the pastoral care, government and administration of the said church of Sura, both in spirituals and temporals, and by the like authority we indulge you, that so long as the said church of Sura shall be detained by the Infidels, you shall not in the least be obliged to go to, or personally reside in that See. Wherefore we have by the same authority instituted and deputed you to be perpetual and irrevocable Coadjutor to the before named Bishop Peter, as long as he shall live, and fill the chair of the said churches of Waterford and Lismore in the government and administration of the said churches of Waterford and Lismore in spirituals and temporals, with full, free and all manner of power and authority to do all and singular those things, which appertain to the office of such a Coadjutor, by right, or by custom, or otherwise howsoever; and we have at the express request and consent of the said

* The instrument is indorsed, *To our beloved Son William Egan, a secular priest elect of Sura.*

Bishop Peter in this behalf, with the advice of our said brethren by the same power we have constituted and designed you to do, make, procure, exact and exercise even those things, which are of the order and office of a Bishop.

Yet so, nevertheless, that during your office of such Coadjutorship, you may not, unless when and for the time that the aforesaid Bishop Peter shall be willing, and expressly allow it, interfere under any color of acquisition, either by yourself or through any other person or persons in the government or administration of the spirituals or temporals of the said churches of Waterford and Lismore, or of their episcopal goods, mensals, or fruits, rents, profits, rights, obventions, or emoluments. And also in case the said Bishop Peter should retire, or depart out of this life, or should in any manner cease to govern the said churches of Waterford and Lismore, or that they should in other manner become vacant before the Apostolic See, altho' at the time of such vacancy you should not have entered upon the exercise of the said office of such Coadjutorship, and that it depends upon you, whether you will exercise it from that or this time: and on the other hand, by the said authority we provide for your said person in the churches of Waterford and Lismore aforesaid, and we appoint you in like manner, Bishop and Pastor over them, and that your person is provided for in those churches of Waterford and Lismore; and we decree, that you shall be the Bishop and Pastor put over them, by fully committing to you the care, government, and administration of the aforesaid churches of Waterford and Lismore, in spirituals and temporals. Yet so, that as soon as you shall, in virtue of this provision, have acquired the peaceable possession, or the apparent possession of such dignity, and the government and administration of the aforesaid churches of Waterford and Lismore, and those episcopal mensals, and such goods or the greater part of them, and you shall have entered upon the duties of your consecration, thenceforth the aforesaid church of Sura shall, of itself, be considered vacant; notwithstanding any apostolic constitutions and ordinances, as far as necessary, of the

aforesaid churches, even by oath, apostolical confirmation, or strengthened by any other corroboration, statutes, or customs: and notwithstanding any privileges, indults, or apostolic letters in any manner granted, confirmed and renewed to the contrary thereof in any manner whatsoever.

In all and singular of which particulars, we, considering the tenor of these presents to be as fully and sufficiently expressed, as if they had been word for word inserted herein, though on other occasions remaining in full force to give effect to their premises; in this instance only, we specially and expressly dispense therewith, and any thing else to the contrary thereof in any manner notwithstanding. We have conceived a firm hope and confidence, that the propitious grace of the Lord assisting you, the aforesaid churches of Waterford and Lismore, will, under your happy government, be usefully and prosperously directed, and will experience the most gratifying increase in spirituals and temporals. But we will, that you wholly refrain from any sort of alienation of the immoveable goods, or precious moveables of the said episcopal mensals of Waterford and Lismore, and that you be bounden to render an account of your management and administration during the time you enjoyed the office of such Coadjutorship, according to the tenor of the constitution of Pope Boniface the VIII. of happy memory, our predecessor, which begins, *Pastoralis*.—And before you enter upon the exercise of any part of your said office of such Coadjutorship, you take the requisite oath, in the usual form, for performing it justly and faithfully at the hands of the Catholic prelate, who shall consecrate you as hereunder.

Wherefore by these our apostolical writings, we charge your discretion, that you do carefully manage, and faithfully follow up that care and administration, that thenceforth the hoped-for fruits may arise, and the odor of your good fame may be more widely diffused by your praise-worthy actions, and the said churches of Waterford and Lismore may rejoice at being committed to the charge of a provident

governor, and a thriving administrator; and that you may beyond the reward of eternal retribution, be deserving of, and obtain the blessing of us, and the aforesaid See, and from thence more plentiful grace, and to our beloved sons the chapters and vassals of the aforesaid churches of Waterford and Lismore, and the clergy and people of the cities and dioceses of Waterford and Lismore, obeying you as members do the head, and the chapters like a Coadjutor and the future Bishop of Waterford and Lismore, humbly intending and displaying due and devout obedience and reverence to you in all those things, which appertain unto the office of such Coadjutorship, while it lasts, and then as to the father and pastor of their souls. And the clergy kindly receiving and honourably treating you out of reverence to us and the said See, may humbly accept all your wholesome admonitions and commands, and procure them to be effectually fulfilled. But let the people devoutly receiving you as the father and pastor of their souls, and shewing you due marks of honor, humbly attend to your wholesome admonitions and commands; so that you may rejoice in having found in them devout children, and they consequently in having found in you a benevolent father. But let your vassals behaving towards you with due honor, be careful to render to you fully the due and accustomed fealty, and the accustomed services of rights due to you from them: otherwise we shall ratify and cause to be observed inviolably any judgment or penalty, which you shall have legitimately passed and decreed against defaulters under the authority of our Lord, until full satisfaction shall have been made. We also entreat and earnestly exhort our venerable brother the Arch-Bishop of Cashell, to whose metropolitical jurisdiction the aforesaid churches of Waterford and Lismore are known to be subject, and we enjoin him by these our apostolical writings, that he do kindly support with the assistance of his grace and favor, you now elect Coadjutor and future Bishop of Waterford and Lismore, and that having the aforesaid

churches of Waterford and Lismore so committed to you, as his suffragan, he may consider them the more earnestly recommended to him from the reverence he owes to us and our said See, in extending and preserving your rights. And you the elect Coadjutor and future Bishop of Waterford and Lismore, resting upon his aid and countenance in this commission of pastoral charge unto you, may you prosper under the favor of God and offer up your condign thanks and prayers to God for the reward of eternal life to your said Arch-Bishop and to us. As to the rest, we kindly wishing to favour you in every thing, that can encrease your conveniency by the tenor of these presents have granted you full and free licence, that you may receive the gift of consecration from whatever Catholic prelate being in the grace and communion of the aforesaid Apostolical See, you chuse; and he may call in as his assistants in this, in lieu of Bishops, two secular priests, although not invested with any ecclesiastical dignity, or regulars of any order or institute, being in like grace and favor, that having first received from you a profession of faith according to the articles already proposed by the Apostolical See, and in our name, and in that of the Roman Church taken the ordinary oath of due fidelity according to the form hereunder written. But we will and by the authority aforesaid we resolve and decree, that unless such aforesaid prelate shall have received from you such oath and profession of faith as aforesaid, the same prelate as well as yourself be instantly suspended from the exercise of any pontifical office, and from the government and administration of the spirituals and temporals of your respective churches. We will moreover, that you do procure as speedily as may be, the profession of faith made by you to be reduced into form and fairly written without blots or faults, and also the oath as tendered to you, to be copied word for word and sent to us in letters patent signed with your seal by your own messenger. But the form of the oath which you shall take is this:—
 I, William Egan, Elect of Sura, and deputed by Apostolical Authority Coadjutor to the Right Reverend Doctor Peter

Crew, the present Bishop of Waterford and Lismore, in the government and administration of the churches of Waterford and Lismore, over which the said Peter Bishop now presides, and future Bishop of Waterford and Lismore from this hour forward will be faithful and obedient to blessed Peter the Apostle, and to the Holy Roman See, and to our Lord the Pope Clement XIV. and his successors canonically coming in. I will give no advice nor consent, nor do any action by which they may lose their life, or even a member, or be arrested by any malicious caption, or violent hands may in any manner whatsoever be laid upon them, or any injury be done to them, under any pretext or color whatsoever. But I will discover to no one what I shall know of any councils, which they shall confide to me in person, or by their Nuncios, or by letters to their hurt. I will assist them to retain and defend the Roman Papacy, and the royalties of St. Peter against all men, saving the rights of my order.—I will honorably entertain the Legate of the Holy See in going and returning, and will help him in his necessities. I will take care to preserve, defend, encrease and promote the rights, honors, privileges and authority of the Holy Roman Church, our Lord the Pope and his aforesaid successors. I will neither be of counsel, nor concerned in any act, nor enter into any contract, by which evil-minded persons may combine any thing against our said Lord, or the said Holy Roman Church, or to the prejudice of their right, honor, rank and power. And if I shall know any such thing to be carried on, or procured by any persons whomsoever, I will hinder it with all my might, and as speedily as possible, and will make it known to our said Lord or to some other person, through whom it may come to his knowledge. I will with all my might observe, and cause to be observed by others, the rules of the Holy Fathers, the decrees, ordinances or dispositions, reservations, provisions and apostolical mandates.* I

* Sir John Cox Hippley, the indefatigable collector of documents and illustrations concerning the communications of his Majesty's Roman

will oppose and impugn to my utmost all heretics and rebels to our said Lord, and his aforesaid successors. When summoned I will come to the synod, unless I shall be prevented by some canonical impediment. I will personally visit the shrines of the Apostles once in every four years. And I will render an account to our said Lord and to his aforesaid successors, of all

Catholic subjects with the See of Rome, and their dependence upon her *in spirituals*, has in the appendix to the substance of his speech on seconding Mr. Grattan's motion for referring the petition of the Roman Catholics of Ireland to a committee of the House of Commons, on Friday the 18th of May, 1810 (LIII. 2d edition) given the following account of the

**“ ALTERATION OF THE PONTIFICAL OATH TAKEN BY
BISHOPS AT THEIR CONSECRATION.**

*“ From an Audience had of his Holiness Pius VI. on the
9th day of June, 1791.*

“ ADDRESSED TO THE ROMAN CATHOLIC ARCHBISHOPS OF IRELAND.

“ The Archbishops Metropolitans of the kingdom of Ireland represented to his Holiness, that from the ignorance or malice of some persons, certain expressions in the form of the oath prescribed in the Roman ritual to be taken by Bishops at their consecration, and by Archbishops on receiving the pall, have been misinterpreted: which has added new perplexities to those, which they daily experience in a kingdom, where the Catholic faith is not the religion of the state, wherefore they humbly requested, if it should appear expedient to his Holiness, that he would vouchsafe to apply a remedy by some act of his Apostolic vigilance. His Holiness, on this report being made to him by me the underwritten, all circumstances of the case maturely considered, was graciously pleased to grant, that the Bishops of the kingdom of Ireland, at their consecration, and the Archbishops on receiving the pall, may use the same form of oath, which was taken by the Archbishop of Mohilow, in the empire of the Muscovites, by permission of his said Holiness, which is as follows:

my pastoral office, and of all things in any manner appertaining unto the state of my church, the discipline of my clergy and people, and the souls committed to my charge. And I will in my turn humbly receive all apostolic commands, and most diligently perform them. All which, if I should be detained by any impediment, I will fulfill by a certain messenger specially appointed for this purpose from the body of my chapter, or by some other dignified clergyman, or otherwise holding a parsonage, or if I should have none such by some diocesan priest, or if there should be wanting any such clergyman, by some other secular priest, or regular of known probity and religion, fully instructed of all these matters. But of any impediment of that sort, I will by legal proofs to be transmitted by such aforesaid special messenger duly apprize the Cardinal

"I, N. N. as in the Roman Pontifical to the clause. *All heretics, schismatics and rebels against our said Lord and his successors aforesaid, I will to the utmost of my power prosecute and oppose.* (Bishop of Cloyne's translation), which is entirely omitted: Afterwards the words: "The Cardinal Prefect of the sacred congregation for propagating the faith," are substituted instead of "The Cardinal Proponent in the congregation of the sacred council." The form concludes with these words. *I will observe all and every one of these things the more inviolably, as I am firmly convinced, that there is nothing contained in them, which can be contrary to the fidelity I owe to his most serene King of Great Britain and Ireland, and to his successors on the throne. So help me God, and those holy Gospels of God. Thus I promise and engage.*

I, N. N. ARCH-BISHOP OR BISHOP, &c.

Dated at Rome, in the house of the sacred congregation, on the 23d day of June, 1791.

L. CARDINAL ANTONELLI, PREFECT.

A. ARCHBISHOP ADONEN, SECRETARY."

(+ SEAL.)

of the holy Roman Church presiding in the congregation of the sacred council. I will not sell the possessions belonging to my mensal, nor will I give them away, nor pledge them, nor make any new enfeoffments, nor in any manner will I alienate them, even with the consent of the chapter of my church, without having consulted the Roman Pontiff. I am willing to incur that instant the penalties contained in a certain ecclesiastical constitution published upon this matter. So help me God and these his holy Gospels. Dated at Rome, at St. Mary Major's, under the Fisherman's Ring, on the 8th day of March, 1771, in the second year of our Pontificate.

A. CARD. NIGRONUS.

END OF THE APPENDIX.

Postscript.

“WHILST I was closing these last sheets for the Press, an unexpected “proof has reached me, by which I find,” (5 Col. Postscript) that your recent conduct has notoriously fixed you with certain symptoms, mentioned in the Note (p. 276). “Affectation and boast of general respect and docility to the Church. Contempt and opposition to its Governors. Cant upon speculative obedience. Contumacy against practical submission.” I also say after you, that “when I began this work, I little expected this conclusive evidence” (5 Col. Postscript) of your eagerness to prove, “by your conduct to your spiritual superior, that you are equally restive and refractory in practice as in theory.” (Antea p. 363 and 264). In scrutinizing by the rules of History (Antea XI.) your general conduct and character as setting up pretensions to a name and reputation in life, it is imperative upon me to submit my discoveries up to the latest moment both to your countrymen and to my own. This is my reason for adding a Postscript to a very long Letter. Upon a subject so delicate and important, nothing material should be suppressed from those, who are in any manner interested in it.

It is now matter of notoriety, that Bishop Poynter since the death of Dr. Douglass, has totally interdicted your Reverence in the London District, as Dr. Milner before had in the midland district; and for the same cause. (Antea 263). Fitting is it also to be known to all those, whom you would persuade, (1 Col. 15) that Ireland stands in need of the interference and protection of Law; (1 Col. 24). Is the responsibility of Law never to be known in that church? that whenever any Priest of the midland district had refused to admit you to the Sacraments without a retraction of the unsound doctrines published in your Letters and Addresses to your countrymen, he uniformly received a Letter from your great and munificent Patron, forbidding him to enter Stowe premises, or to hold communication with any person within them. Such are your “salutary restraints of lea-

“gal responsibility, avowedly consistent with their faith, which sober and
 “titanical Statesmen endeavour in pity to the Irish People to interpose
 “as an Ægis of defence between their liberties and the usurpations, &c.
 “of the Hierarchy of the Irish Church.” (1 Col. 9.) Inebriating foretaste
 of the blessings of Veto and arrangements! How beautiful are the feet of
 them, that preach the Gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good
 things?

It is not improbable, that your recent interdict in the London district
 may have been amongst the inducements, which brought you over to
 Ireland: where you might animate your desponding and disheartened
 party to rally round the Columbanian standard of antipapacy, and where
 you anticipated some party laurels, from a single handed charge upon a
 Metropolitan, with which you might on your return to the fine nation,
 strew the vestibule of your great and munificent patron, and decorate
 the brows of your captain and fellow soldier Sir J. C. Hipposley and Mr.
 Butler. Your landing in the metropolis (Dublin) threw your itinerant
 “sanctity wisdom and learning” (antea 326) under the Spiritual jurisdiction
 of the most Rev, Dr. Troy, who both Sir J. C. Hipposley and your
 Reverence falsely assert, was appointed to the Archiepiscopal See of
 Dublin by the recommendation of the Irish Government. The fact is, he
 was translated from Ossory to Dublin by the late Pope, at the instance of the
 sacred congregation of Propaganda: and after that appointment had been
 actually made, though before it were known in Ireland, he was recommen-
 ded to the See of Dublin by all his coprovincial prelates and 12 others: and
 government was well pleased, though it did not interfere with the appoint-
 ment; as Mr. Secretary Orde wrote officially to thank him for his exertions in
 Ossory to put down the White Boys, in 1784; as may be seen in my Historical
 Review, 2 Vol. p. 107, where both his Pastoral, and the Secretary’s Letter
 are given at full length. I presume Doctor Troy has in the performance
 of his pastoral duty attentively read your Five Addresses or Letters to your
 countrymen, and I necessarily conclude, that the lecture imposed upon
 him an imperious necessity of expressing his marked reprobation of the Au-
 thor of so much deceit, error, scandal, false and unsound doctrine, as is
 contained in them. He could be little pleased at the addition of personal
 exertions to the forced circulation of those works of insidious and malign
 industry, to poison the minds of his flock. He must see more clearly and
 deeply than most men, into your Reverences views in broaching these Anti-
 Papal doctrines at this particular æra, and coming over in person with a
 diplomatic commission from Doctors Hipposley and Butler to vaccinate
 your countrymen for VETO and ARRANGEMENTS, because he knows the
 direct falsity and fallacy of whatever you have said, to disprove your own

exertions to procure the mitre of Elphin, during the life of the late Doctor French. For some months before the death of that Prelate, you, Rev. and most learned Doctor, wrote to Doctor Troy, soliciting his, and the most Rev. Doctor O'Reilly's (of Armagh) recommendation of you (Dr. Charles O'Connor) to the Holy See, as a fit and proper person to succeed Doctor French in that Diocese. Doctor Troy communicated the Letter to Doctor O'Reilly, and in his answer to it he distinctly stated, that they thought it highly improper to recommend any one for that See, or any other, until it became vacant. And for the truth of this extraordinary and incredible instance of self-assurance, arrogance, and prostitution of all canonical decency, I have full liberty and authority to refer any person, whom the knowledge of the fact concerns, to both or either of those truly respectable and revered Prelates, who will vouch for the correctness of this statement. Little then will any of my readers wonder, that shortly after your late arrival in Dublin, Doctor Troy should have written to you the following Letter,

“ 3, Cavendish Row, Rutland Square,
“ Dublin, 17th July, 1812.

Rev. Doctor Charles O'Connor,

Rev. Sir,

Since your late arrival in this city, you have had no faculties from me. I now think it proper to warn you, that by the exercise, public or private, of any sacerdotal function in this Arch-diocese, you must necessarily incur the censures inflicted by the laws of the Roman Catholic Church on such clergymen of her communion, as presume to officiate without the permission, or contrary to the express will of the Ordinary.

I remain, Rev. Sir,

Your very humble Servant in Christ,

✕ J. T. TROY, D. D. &c.

THE FOLLOWING ANSWER WAS ON THE SAME DAY RETURNED.

“ Doctor O'Connor presents his Compliments.

He has received Doctor Troy's Note forbidding him the Exercise of any Sacerdotal function in Dublin either in public or private, and menacing censures, &c. &c. BUT ASSIGNING NO CAUSE WHATEVER for such extraordinary proceeding. Doctor O'Connor is in virtue of his ordination

entitled by **DIVINE RIGHT** to offer the holy sacrifice discreetly and modestly, as he has hitherto done, in any part of the world, to which business may lead him, until such a time as **IMMORALITY, HERESY, or SCHISM**, is in a fair open trial canonically proved against him. This is one of the most sacred laws of the Catholic Church, * to which all Bishops, as well as Priests are bound to submit, and having the Catholic Church for his guide, and professing the most sincere respect for Episcopal Jurisdiction canonically exercised, but holding the abuse of that jurisdiction to be the source of many calamities to his native country, Doctor O'Connor will continue with all due deference, as he has hitherto done, to offer up his prayers for the Irish Nation, for his friends and for his enemies, in a modest discreet way, until such time, as he is by a canonical decision declared out of the communion of the church, to which he belongs; not by Doctor Troy's permission, but by baptism, and by a laborious and faithful discharge of his duty, and he trusts also, and be it said with humility, by an exemplary life of fifty years. If Doctor Troy has no objection, Doctor O'Connor will have his Note and this Note inserted in to-morrow's Evening Post. He begs an answer before then.

"11, Nassau-Street, July 17, 1812."

* The words of the Council of Seville are "We have found, that **Fraxilianus**, a Priest of the Church of Corduba had been unjustly deposed by his Bishop, and condemned, though innocent. Therefore to prevent such presumption of any of us in future, We have decreed, **ACCORDING TO THE DECISION OF THE ANCIENT FATHERS**, that none of us, shall hereafter dare to depose any Priest or Deacon without a trial in Council. For there are many, who condemn them without an examination by a **TYRANNICAL POWER**, and not by Canonical Authority, and as they advance some through favour, so others they depress through envy, condemning them through slight suspicions, whose crimes they cannot prove. If they, who in a temporal state have had the honor to be made freemen by their Lords, **CAN NOT BE REDUCED TO SERVITUDE**, unless they be publicly accused at the Presidents tribunal in the place of judicature; how much more ought those to have a **FAIR, LEGAL TRIAL**, who are invested with ecclesiastical honor and **CONSECRATED AT THE ALTAR**, who ought not to be condemned by **ONE**, nor to be deprived of the privilege of their dignity by a **SINGLE JUDGE**; **BUT BEING BROUGHT BEFORE THE SYNOD, SHALL BE JUDGED** there, and what the Canons prescribe concerning them is to be decreed.

See Cardinal D'Aguirre's Collection of Councils, published at Rome, 1694. Folio. Tom. 11. p. 462. Canon. 6.

Doctor O'Connor submits to the Laws of the Church."

POSTSCRIPT.

“ Irishmen, countrymen of that great Columbanus, who never submitted to ipse dixits, &c. (4 Col. 7, 8.) take a retrospective view of the ground, over which we have travelled.” Be you my judges, whether I have followed the rules laid down by Tully (Antea xi) in bringing before you the general conduct and character of the *cidevant soi disant* Columbanus. Take this first ebullition of his zeal, as the opening dawn of the new Era, and his new lights.

Quid dignum tanto feret hic promissor hiatu?

How will the boaster hold his gaping rate?—FRA’S. HOR.

By the shade of Columbanus you shall hear me. (5 Col. 130.) Dr. O’Connor is in virtue of his ordination entitled by divine right to offer the holy sacrifice. As an historian I touch not your divine right either of offering the holy sacrifice, or of evangelizing your countrymen. As well might I pluck a beam from the Sun as touch one fibre of it. But in an Historical Letter vitally affecting the honor, credit, and veracity of your country and religion, which took its rise out of your unfounded charges against their historian, it would be criminal not to set before their eyes, in faithful colouring, the principal performer in that tragical exhibition, which you are come over (on a summer engagement I presume) to get up in Ireland. I have before said, that your “character is as new, as Caliban’s in Shakespeare’s *Tempest*.” (App. 49.) Nothing was like that man, and nothing was ever so unlike himself: (Ibid.) He informs his countrymen, (1 Col. 104.) “that ordination gives only an aptitude to serve the church by preaching, teaching, and administering the Sacraments, but he thereby receives no parish; he for that must await the mission of the Church; that ordination and canonical mission are necessary requisites *jure divino* for Bishops and Priests (1 Col. 105); that without a mission from the Church there can be no ecclesiastical jurisdiction, no valid administration of Sacraments: that (4 Col. 38) the ministry of Priests is illicit without a mission: that according to the Council of Trent, no Bishop can give jurisdiction in the diocese of another,” which seems to import, that without the licence or authority of the ordinary no Priest can licitly perform his ministry. What mean you then, Rev. and most learned Doctor, by your *jure divino* travelling commission, that converts your aptitude for the ministry into a licence & right to exercise it in any part of the world, to which business may lead you: though you qualify it by two adverbs, discretely and modestly. Thus by a very self-sufficient arrogation of discretion and modesty you oust every ordinary church governor throughout christendom of his jurisdiction or power of granting, withholding, or withdrawing faculties, licence or authority to perform the highest functions of the Christian Ministry. You thus affect or attempt, (I will not say unca-

nonically and irreverently) but indecently, and stupidly to prevent Doctor Troy (and consequently every Bishop throughout Christendom) to refuse, withhold, or withdraw from every transient or occasionally resident Priest (in a metropolis they must be numerous) the licit and valid exercise of the most awful functions of the Priesthood. *Eum oportet esse bene & naviter impudentem*, who can thus pretend, that he has a *jure divino* range over every part of the world, to which business may lead him, in defiance and in contradiction to every church governor, but his own, into whose temporary jurisdiction he shall come, to perform a function denied even to Angels (*Antea* 259), when it is notorious, throughout all the dispersed churches of the British Empire, that you have by a formal interdict been prohibited by the Bishop of the London district, within whose jurisdiction you published your unsound and dangerous doctrines, from offering that holy sacrifice, on account of your unworthiness, and the public scandal produced by those very publications. If Doctor Troy have, as your Reverence holds, *jure divino* the right of governing, and possess spiritual jurisdiction over the Arch-Diocese of Dublin, without any pretensions to theology, as a simple layman, I must necessarily infer, that knowing what he does know of your Reverence, he would have grievously neglected his pastoral duty, and brought irreparable scandal on the Church, had he permitted, licensed or not prohibited you to perform any sacerdotal function within his jurisdiction, whilst you are interdicted from exercising them by your own Prelate; and whilst your scandalous publications are not only not retracted, but forced into circulation to the disedification of all, the danger of the weak, lax and ignorant, and the contempt, disgust, and horror of the well-informed and steady part of the faithful.

From your unvarying infidelity in translating, you cannot expect credit for the accuracy of your English quotation of the Council of Seville. But should you on this occasion have varied from your habitual practice, by giving the real sense of the Author quoted, you have still fastidiously adhered to another of your predominating habits: irrelevancy of application. In quoting the case of *Fragilianus*, you have let down your judgment beneath anility. By your own statement, that Priest was dispossessed of his Ecclesiastical benefice (a freehold for life), where the civil magistrate sanctioned such establishments, by his Bishop, who was not authorized by law to exercise any such power over that property. At no time; before or since the reformation, could property of that nature be shifted or transmuted without the sanction of some juridical act or judgment. Well might I deny you credit for accuracy of translation, when you betray such palpable infidelity in quoting from your own work this very case of *Fragitanus*, as you there call him. (5 Col. 104.) In order to disguise the

inapplicability of that case to your own, you have most unwarrantably kept back an essential feature in the Bishop's excess of power, by the banishment of that Priest, which when you had no particular view to answer by the suppression, you brought forth in that work. He must be more than blind, who does not perceive the wide difference between privation of property and banishment, and the prohibition or refusal of faculties to an itinerant Priest; particularly to one, who is interdicted by his own Prelate for publishing the unsound doctrines, which he is endeavouring to propagate among the flock of the Pastor, who so refuses them. You have quoted the resolution of a provincial Synod, evidently bottomed on practices arising out of a civil establishment, as a most sacred law of the Catholic Church, to which all Bishops as well as Priests are bound to submit. The Catholic Church existed for the three first centuries without any civil establishment at all; and many parts of it, like the Church of Ireland, have subsisted for the three last centuries without any civil establishment, upon which such resolution or law could operate. And this irrelevant note of ostentation you ineptly obtrude upon your temporary spiritual superior, in order to prove, that until such a time as immorality, heresy, or schism, is in a fair, open, trial canonically proved against you, (in a country where for want of forensic jurisdiction no such trial can be had) you are entitled jure divino to officiate without the permission and contrary to the express will of the Ordinary. I again call my reader's attention to that Arian lubricity, by which you affect to elude the letter of disobedience, and to keep up the appearance of resistance. Your Prelate warns you against the public or private exercise of any sacerdotal function in his diocese, which in his discretion he is entitled to do. You reply, that you will continue to offer up your prayers, &c. You say not in the mass. The one is a sacerdotal function, the other a commendable act, and a duty in all Christians. Believe me most learned Doctor, that this attack upon an Arch-Bishop, which in a senseless and shameless manner you wished to invite the public to take a part in, by giving it publicity in the Newspapers, is disgusting and revolting to your countrymen; it will not be eulogized by the fine Nation, whose generous and heavenly sentiments of liberty of conscience, it is impossible for Irishmen not to admire! (5 Col. 123.) I much doubt whether your virtuous, admired and esteemed new friend, Sir John Cox Hipplesley, even under the enthusiasm of his new lights, will follow up this rude, senseless, and innocuous blow at his old friend and correspondent Doctor Troy, for exercising spiritual jurisdiction within his Arch-Diocese, over a Priest whilst resident in it. Sure I am, that it will not be publicly commended by your learned friend Mr. Charles Butler.

This recent effort of your Reverences' Anti-papal prowess, from which you anticipate such crops of laurel, has reduced to practice most of the charges, suggestions and inferences contained in the foregoing letter. I again repeat. "If ambitious of singularity, you have certainly attained that object; *nil æquale homini fuit illi*: (ant. 274) We have read of a man, that had been caught up into paradise, saying of himself, I will not glory but in mine infirmities. But he also applying to "the good sense of a nation (the Corinthians) famed for quickness of perception, keenness of wit and vivacity not to be cajoled by the hypocritical canting of men. &c." (1 Cor. 24) warns them, that there "are false Apostles, deceitful labourers, transforming themselves into the Apostles of Christ" (2 Cor. XI. 13) Now as it is evident, that you, Reverend and most learned Doctor, glory not in your infirmities, but taking the opposite course, you boast on all occasions of your own merits and good deeds, representing yourself in Dodesley, (ant. 52) as "the worthy inheritor and able representative of the peculiar attainments of your progenitor," furnishing self drawn testimonies of your being "a fit person to succeed Dr. French in the diocese of Elphin" to be handed up to his Holiness by Dr. O'Reilly of Armagh, and Dr. Troy of Dublin, and recently that is on the 17th of July 1812, you glory (I apply not to you the words of St. Paul, *Ib. v. ii.* I am become a fool in glorying) in your letter to Dr. Troy, of your laborious and faithful discharge of your duty, of your humility and exemplary life of 50 years; as an historian it becomes my duty, to trace the means, by which, after failure of all honest exertions on your own part, and the solicited mediations of Dr. O'Reilly, Dr. Troy, the most Noble antifanatical Marquis, and even the Zebedean canvas not having insured the Mitre of Elphin, you undertook to transform yourself into an Apostle of Christ. Maddened with the titillating thrill of posthumous renown ("something whispers into my ear, that I may look with confidence to posterity" (5. Col. 296) You speculate upon "a golden legend, in which (1. Col. 26) one day will be memorable for the festival (of a St. Columbanus, as you say of) a St. Cobbett, St. Finnerty, and a St. Horne Took." That favourite theme of the posthumous mead of virtue engrosses your very soul. (*Ib.* 19) "Fanaticism boasts of its Martyrs, Usurpers have been deified, and Buonaparte has already marked his own apotheosis in the sword of Orion." You most learned Dr. have already marshalled yourself in the ranks of the holy Confessors, who once illumined and edified benighted Ierna, by applying to yourself in your Letter to Doctor Troy, the whole substance of the hymn, which your church sings on their festivals. You have paraphrased it in prose; I do it in metre, as more congenial with the spirit of the original.

Qui pius, prudens, humilis, pudicus,
Sobriam duxit sine labe vitam, &c.

The man most fit for Elphin's See,
From virtue, lore, and pedigree
Is he, whose life for fifty years
Chaste, spotless, wise and good appears.
Just such a man, I plight my honor,
Is the most learned CHARLES O'CONOR.

ALPHABETICAL INDEX.

A

- ABBOTT**, Charles, Mr. refuses the Author access to the State Papers, when Secretary in Ireland, p. 25.
- Addington**, Right Honourable Henry, Vide Lord Viscount Sidmouth, 25.
- America** Hierarchy, there formed, 225. Appendix 8, 99.
Letter from the American to the Irish Hierarchy. Appendix 99 to 102.
Address of the American Hierarchy to their flocks about Pope Pius VII. Appendix 102 to 107.
- Aquin**, St. Thomas of, explicit as to the jurisdictional authority of the Pope in 13th Century, 306.
- Arius**, his lubricity and dreadful end, 133.
His subtle errors and sanctimonious appearance, 303.
- Arnaud**, the noted Jansenist, inveighs like Columbanus, against the condemnation of Quesnell. Appendix 32.
- Athanasius**, St. how considered by some moderns, 304.
holds jurisdictional authority of the See of Rome. Ibid.
Cotemporary with St. Patrick. Ibid.
- Augustinus**, Jansens' book so called. Vide JANSESTICAL.
- Author** grossly charged by Doctor O'Connor.—Pref. II to VIII.
His views for publishing this Letter.—Pref. IX.
Ditto, in writing his last History.—Pref. XII.
His efforts to disclose the truth of Irish History, 2,
Special circumstances calling upon him for publication, 4, 5.
The circumstances, under which he wrote Irish History, 9;
His correspondence with Dr. M'Dermott, 13.
His first knowledge of Doctor O'Connor, Ibid.
Acquires Doctor O'Connor's suppressed work, 14.
Offends Marquis of Buckingham by his Historical Review, 15.
His first Letter to Doctor O'Connor, 21.
His postliminious Preface, 25.

INDEX.

- Author** His second and last Letter to Doctor O'Connor, 26 to 28.
 Ditto to Doctor M'Dermott, (Note Ibid)
 His Dissertation on Antiquity of Irish Hist. published in 1809, 48.
 Under injunction, 49.
 Reflects on Doctor O'Connor's professions, 66.
 Retorts the charge of Anachronism upon Columbanus, 120, 1, 2.
 Gives proofs of Columbanus's wish for an Irish Bishoprick, 127 to 137.
 His Church and State, 143, 4.
 His account of the Civil Constitution of the French Clergy, 153.
 Has an honorary degree of Doctor of Civil Law in the University of Oxford, 170.
 Gave in his Historical Review what he could collect from the preserved though suppressed Volume, 235 to 239.
 His opinions of Papal supremacy delivered in his Church and State, 1795, p. 255.
 His note in his History about the Acts collating Spiritual Jurisdiction, 273, 4.
 His execration of Jansenism.—Appendix 29.
 His motives for laying open Jansenism.—Appendix 30.
 Zealous in his efforts to prevent its progress.—Appendix 37.
 His Case Stated, published in 1791.—Appendix 52 to 82.
 Explains what might appear not clear and explicit beyond cavil or doubt, 342.

B

- Benedict, Pope, XIV.** says the jurisdiction of Bishops is controulable by the Pope, 307.
Berwick, Duke of, no Irishman, as falsely asserted by Columbanus, 169.
Beveridge, Doctor, Bishop of St. Asaph, largely quoted by Bishop Fleetwood in favour of Coadjutors, 333.
Bishops, Irish Catholic, their Synodical Resolutions at Tullow, 178.—Ap. V.
 Thank Doctor Milner for opposing 5th Resolution, 259.
 Sometimes consecrated without jurisdiction, 319.
 May be in Episcopal Order and liable to religious rule, Ibid.
ANATHEMA against those, who deny, that such as are appointed by the Pope are legitimate and true Bishops, 321 to 357.
 Instances alledged by Columbanus of their being validly appointed in Ireland without Diocesan postulation, 341 to 357.
 The qualities of a proper one according to St. Paul, 366, 7.
Bishoprics not devisable, as asserted by Columbanus, 357, 8.
Blanchard, his opinions censured, and cause of Bishop Milner's Pastorals.

INDEX.

6

Board of British Catholics self-appointed, 150.

Set forward the 5th Resolution, 250, 1.

Bossuet, the great Bishop of Meaux, what he said of the five propositions of Jansens.—Appendix 32.

His sublime opinion of the Ministers of God's Church.—App. 44.

Interested himself in procuring to have Richer's Works condemned.—App. 46.

Buckingham, Marquis, offended at the Author's Historical Review, 15.

His conduct in the House of Peers, 16.

His portrait of Mr. Grattan, 17, 18.

His conduct on King's recovering, 18.

Refuses to present the Address of the Commons in favor of the Prince, 18.

Compared with Ormond, 77.

Who he is, 79.

Columbanus's 5th Address dedicated to him.

The half of the Tellership of the Exchequer, (Sixty thousand pounds per annum) would afford an appropriate motto over the O'Connor collection in Stowe Library, 325.

Burnet, Bishop, admits the King to be founder of all Spiritual power, 180.

Butler, Mr. writer of the Blue Books, 148.

Panegyriized by Columbanus.—Appendix 130.

His indefatigable co-operator, 29.

SET and PLIED Sir John Cox Hippesley on Veto, 346.

Intimate with Lord Redesdale, 347, 8.

C

Canning, Mr. mystical effects of his Motion to refer the Catholic Question to a Committee next Session, 338.

Carroll, most Rev. John, Archbishop of Baltimore.—Appendix, No. VIII.

Catholics, English, sworn Whigs and Cisalpines, 145.

Board of British, 249.

Catholic Confederates allowed by Columbanus to have been sincere in their loyalty, 85.

Charles I, King, commands Ormond to treat with the Catholics, 106.

His Letter from Newcastle in 1646 against the peace was either forced or forged, 180.

Church, temporal head of, and Defender of the Faith, according to Columbanus, 154.

National, according to Columbanus, 159, 163.

Government. Its analogies to the English Constitution, 359.

B

- Cicero, his rules for writing history.—Preface XI.
- Civil establishment of religion. Vide Establishment.
- Magistrate—quod vide.
- Constitution of French Clergy, 162.
- Power, difference between it and SPIRITUAL POWER, 272.
- Clarendon, Lord, unaccountably praised by Columbanus, who denies his Grandfather's character of him, 242.
- The relator of the massacre at Macgee, which is denied by Columbanus, Ibid.
- Clement, Pope XI. publishes the Bull Unigenitis. Appendix 34.
- Describes the Jansenists in his Bull Vinean Domini Sabbaoth.—Appendix, 34.
- His Bull to the Catholics of Holland, taken as Historical evidence of Jansenism, about their middle period. Appendix, 35.
- Clergy, French Emigrant, 163.
- Gallican Declaration of, on Ecclesiastical Power, 194, 5.—App. No. V.
- Coadjutors, the system of, destructive of Mitre hunting, 333.
- Usual in the Church, Ibid. & 364.
- Columbanus's motives for opposing them, 336 to 340.
- Their appointment discretionary in a Pope, 358.
- Conscientious motives for Pope's appointing them, 366, 7.
- Coadjutorships, nothing more than a reversionary grant of Episcopal Jurisdiction by the Pope, who alone can grant it, 368.
- As early in the church as St. Peter, to whom St. Lidus was Coadjutor, A. D. 55, p. 364, 5.
- So in the first century was Evaristus, Coadjutor to Pope Anacletus. Ibid.
- Sanctioned by the Cannons and council of Trent, 364.
- Collection of Irish Books and MSS. by Mr. Charles O'Connor, best in Europe, 42.
- Mysteriously moved to Stowe, 55.
- Collyer admits that Protestant Bishops are merely King's Ministers, 288.
- Columbanus, vide Rev. Charles O'Connor.
- Concordat entered into by Pius VII. with Napoleon, 163.
- Constitution, English, has strong analogies to church government, 359.
- Curry, Dr. and Charles O'Connor, the father and founders of the Catholic Committee, 235.
- His credit and veracity violently assailed by Columbanus, 240 to 243.

INDEX:

D

- De Marca** holds supreme jurisdictional authority in Pope jure divino, 302.
- Digby, Lord**, entrusted by Ormond with his Machiavelism, 105.
Admits King Charles's Letter from Newcastle in 1646, to be either forced or forged, 110.
- Dupin**, a noted French Jansenist, some account of his life, conduct and condemned works.—Appendix, 46.
- Dubourg, Anne**, a noted Calvinist executed under Henry II. his profession of faith.—Appendix, 46.
- Duigenan, Doctor**, abused by Doctor O'Gonor, 51, 243.
- Durand**, predecessor of Bossuet held jurisdiction in all others than the Pope derivative and limited only as the Pope pleased, 312.

E

- Elphin**, See of, canvassed for and by Dr. O'Connor, 119, 160, 1, 245, post. 3.
- Englishmen**, their practical errors, for two centuries, about the regal Supremacy, 279 to 287.
- English protesting Catholic Dissenters**, 131.
Attempted in 1791 to throw off their subjection to the Vicars Apostolic, 150.—Appendix 34, 5.
A set of non-descripts, 251.
- Erasmus** thought St. Paul would approve of the form of church government, as it was in his days, 313.
- Establishment**, civil, of religion; its rights elucidated at the Fermanagh Assizes, 157 to 160.
None in the Christian church for the three first, none in the church of Ireland for the three last centuries, 261 to 266.
- Eusebius**, slight sketch of his character, 7.

F

- Fitzjames**, Son (and not Brother) to the Duke of Berwick, 169.
- Fitzwilliam**, sacrificed to the Protestant Ascendancy Party, sincerely wished to give religious freedom to Ireland unconditionally, p. 340.
- Fleetwood**, Protestant Bishop, supports coadjutors in his work, "Treatise of Church and Church Government," p. 333.
- Fleury**, Abbe, unfair advantages taken of him by Columbanus, 312.
Confounds the first elements of discrimination between the two Powers; his Work altered; too much wedded to ancient discipline, 312 to 315.
Contradicts Columbanus as to the divine rights of Priests, 316 to 319.

Fox, out-voted upon his East India Bill by the manœuvre of Lord Buckingham, 15.

French, Right Rev. Doctor, Catholic Bishop of Ferns, late Bishop of Elphin, 249.

His spirit and feeling, 88, 9.

G

Gallician Clergy, Declaration of, misrepresented by Columbanus, 182 to 200.

The original in Latin and English, and the mutilated and garbled copy of Columbanus. Appendix V. 135.

Agree in 1620, with St. Athanasus, and St. Bernard, upon jurisdictional authority of Rome, 315.

Ganganelli, his Bull, appointing Dr. Egan, coadjutor of Waterford, and Lesmore. Appendix No. X.

Gaschet, the approver and instigator of Blanchard, and of his doctrines, 201.

Grattan, his honourable testimony of the Author's History of Ireland, 15.

His portrait of the Marquis of Buckingham, 17, 18.

Misled and deceived about Veto, retracts his former opinion, 247, to 254, 346, 7.

Grenville, Lord judges fairly of the Oath of Supremacy, 147.

His former opinion in favour of Veto suppressed by Columbanus, 244.

Misled and deceived about Veto, retracts, 247 to 254, 346, 7.

Grey, Earl, misled and deceived about Veto, and retracts his former opinions, 247 to 254, 346, 7.

Grotius, for a visible head to the Church for preserving unity, 296.

H

Harris, the Historian, his insolence represented by Charles O'Connor, 239.

Hierarchy, Irish, vide Bishops.

Heylin, Rev. Dr. a Protestant divine, supports the jure divino rights of Bishops against the Acts of Parliament, 280.

Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims in the 9th century, explicit as to jurisdictional authority in the Pope, 307.

Hippesley, Sir John Cox, his amphibious speech on 31st May, 1811, 338.

Attended and instructed by Mr. Butler, 339.

His Speech on Mr. Canning's Motion, 12th June, 1812, 339.

Privy to Veto and Arrangements in 1796, 340.

How worked upon by his new instructors. 341, 2, 3, 4.

Turns against his old confidential friend, Doctor Milner, and sides with his opponent, Mr. Butler, 341.

INDEX.

9

Set and FlieD by Mr. Butler and Doctor O'Connor, 346.

His strange unsubstantiated declarations in the House of Commons, 346.

Affects not to wish to encroach on the church, Ibid.

Says the church itself is tired of a foreign yoke, 348.

Alarmist at the intrigues of Rome, Ibid.

Called upon to name the Archbishop to whose See a foreigner was appointed by the Pope without his knowledge, 348, 9.

Verifies his own diplomatic commission to the Court of Rome, 349.

Account of his correspondence with the Pope and Cardinals, and his successful negotiations on behalf of the Pretender, 349 to 351.

Worked up to sound the tocsin against the intrigues of Rome, and grievances of a foreign yoke, 351, 2.

Hoax played on him about the conviction of one Levery for swearing in persons to be true to the Duke of York and his committees; what probably thereby meant, 351 to 355.

Historian, delicate grounds of a cotemporary.—Pref. X.

Severe duties of an, 3.

I

Inchiquin, Lord rebellious, and has good understanding with Ormond, 103.

Indefectibility of the Church, what, 194, 197.

Intallibility of the Church, 194 to 197,

of councils upon the christian revelation.—Appendix, 407.

Innocent, Pope X. framed a test for Jansenists.—Appendix, 33.

Institution, what it is in the high and low clergy, 261, 287.

J

Jansens, what he said of 3 of his disciples.—Appendix, 29.

who he was.—Appendix, p. 30, 1.

Jansenists, the Puritans of the Roman Catholic Church, 168.—Ap. 41, 45.

will not subscribe the bull Unigenitus, 169.

Paschal panegirized by Mr. Joseph Berrington, 278.

Touchstone to know them by, 279.—Ap. No. 113. p. 28 and 367.

Attempts to nationalize a church in Holland, as Columbanus does in the British Empire. Appendix, 39.

Jansenism, system of.—Appendix, 28.

The Authors views and motives in laying it open.—App. 29, 30.

Port-Royal palladium of, 301.

Jansenistical antipathy to Rome, 167.

Sympathies of Columbanus, 162, 9.

Sympathies and principles of Calvinists and Jansenists, 219.

The 5 propositions.—Appendix, p. 31.

Formally condemned, 32.

Formulary framed by Pope Innocent X. to exclude them from livings, &c. Appendix, 33.

Most Jansenists took it to be let into livings or benefices, Ibid.

Symptoms and sentiments, Appendix, 38.

Johnson, Dr. solicited and paid in vain for vindicating the truth of Irish History, 234.

Jurisdiction, spiritual independent of the civil magistrate, 165, 2 and 23.

Necessarily exists in head of the Church, 224.

Given to a new hierarchy in the United States of America, 225. Appendix, VIII.

K

Keogh, Mr. Junr. abused by Columbanus 214.

Key's power of given by Christ to endure for ever according both to Catholics and Protestants, 269, 284.

C

Kildea, Father a Franciscan Friar, about to have been appointed Bishop of Quebec. Appendix, VIII 107.

King, our has not in any sense the supremacy of power (which is in Parliament) 257.

L

Launois, one of Dr. O'Connor's Jansenistical French Theologians. —Some account of his conduct and writings. Appendix, 48.

Termed an illustrious Divine by Walsh, 302.

Lesly, Protestant Divine, for the divine rights of Bishops, 285, 6.

Highly spoken of by Mr. Whitaker, a most respectable Protestant Divine, 286, 7.

M

Mac Dermott, Dr. Hugh who that worthy character is, 10.

His interesting letter, from 10, to 12.

His letter to the author, 13.

His opinion of his manuscript 15.

His letter to the Author, 19 to 21.

Ditto, excellent and interesting, 33 to 35.

His character of his Grandfather, Mr. Charles O'Connor, 34.

Another letter from him to the Author, 36 to 38.

His last letter to the Author, 39 to 40.

Mc Cleland, Mr. Baron strange judgment of 157, 8, 9.

Magistrate, Civil his power, the same whether christian or heathen varies not with the plus or minus of orthodoxy, 293.

Melanchton approved of the Catholic Church Government, 297.

Milner, Right Rev. Doctor misquoted, and misrepresented by Columbanus, 182 to 193.

His commission of Agency to the Irish clergy, 187.

Occasion of his pastoral and supplement to his own district, 188.

Thanked by the Irish Hierarchy for opposing the 5th resolution, 250

Mission, vide Spiritual Jurisdiction.

Musgrave, Sir Richard Author's Historical letter to him, Pref. 1, 11.

Assimilated to Columbanus, 49 to 52, 240.

Abused by Dr O'Connor, 51.

Warned about Bishop of Ferns, as Columbanus is about the Bishop of Elphin, 203.

Muskerry, Lord brother-in-law to Ormond, and his dying declaration about his perfidy to the Catholics, 89.

N

Nelson, Rev. Doctor, his Character of Sir John Temple, 100

Nicole, a leading Jansenist, devises part of the Stock purse.—Appendix, 38.

Nomination of Bishops presupposes a civil establishment of religion, 257.
Confounded with confirmation by Columbanus, 292:

O

Oaths difference between Elizabeth's Oath of Supremacy, and James's Oath of Allegiance, 132 to 136, 146.

of Supremacy. A Catholic cannot take, 144.

Oath of James equivalent to that of Geo. III. both English, Irish, 153.

The Oath of James 1. British Oath of 39 Geo. III. and Irish Oath of 33 Geo. III. Appendix No. III. 3 to 6.

Bishop's of Consecration. Appendix No. X.

Oath fabricated by the would-be protesting Catholic Dissenters,

- different from the Protestation, and condemned by the Vicars Apostolic, 59 to 79.
- Oath of Consecration altered, and Sir John Cox Hippenesley's account of it. Appendix No. X. 123
- O'Connor, Charles, of Belanagare, some account of his writings, 20.
- Stated to be one of the Editors of Butler's Lives of Saints, (Irish Edition). Quer. if so? 30.
- His veracity testified by Doctor M'Dermot his maternal Grandson, 33.
- His laudable view in making his collection of Irish Books and MSS. 58 to 61.
- His sentiments contrasted with those of his Grandson, 138, 9.
- And more particularly, 323 to 325.
- His admirable sentiments addressed to Doctor Jennings, 234.
- Ditto to others, 234 to 239.
- Objects to the reality fifty years before the term Veto was in use, 239.
- His veracity and credit violently attacked by his Grandson Columbanns, 240 to 243, 323.
- What his Grandson said of his historical abilities and veracity, before his conversion to the Stowe tactics, 323, 4.
- O'Connor, Doctor Charles, his charges against the Author. Pref. II. to VIII.
- Explanation of his title D. D. 1.
- His pedantic and affected resort to it, 6 to 8.
- His views to rivet dissention in Ireland, 9.
- His first suppressed work, 14.
- His first letter to the Author, 22 to 25.
- His second and last, ditto, 28 to 32.
- His Prospectus in Dodsley, 1803, 41, 5.
- Had a gratuitous education at Rome, 46 appendix 9.
- His Anti-Prelatical disposition, 47.
- Attacks the veracity of his Grandfather, 47.
- His own trumpeter, 52, 54, 63.
- Misapplies his Grandfather's collection, 55.
- Proofs of the sale thereof, 59 to 65.
- Sworn to serve the Irish Mission, 60. Appendix 3.
- Throws his printed History (because true) into the Poddle in Dublin, 53.
- His profession to translate faithfully, 66.
- His farrago of unintelligible pedantry, 67 to 70.
- Still tender of his character with his own countrymen, 74.
- His strained panegyrics of Ormond, and compares him with the Marquis of Buckingham, 74 to 81.
- Admits that Ormond might have saved the Monarchy, 86.
- Affects candor about Ormond, 86, 7, 8.
- His voluntas episcopandi proved, 118. Post. 3.
- His anachronisms, 120.
- His infidelity about the oath of supremacy, 132 to 186.
- Attacks his own Hierarchy, 107 to 142.
- His sentiments contrasted with those of his Grandfather, 138, 9.
- His revolting coarseness of invective, 143.
- Refers to unpublished works, 145.
- Identifies himself with Walsh, 148.
- Cries up and shamefully abandons truth, 153.
- Denies Popes' supreme jurisdiction, 154.
- Misrepresents Civil Constitution of French Clergy, 162.

- Falsifies the synodical resolutions of the English Vicars Apostolic, 171 to 175.
- Falsifies the history of the Duke of Berwick and Fitzjames, Bishop of Soisson, 109.
- Misrepresents the Synod of Tullow, and misquotes the resolutions, 176.
- Misrepresents and misquotes Dr. Milner, and the declaration of the Gallican clergy, 182 to 200.
- Attempts to draw his countrymen into direct Schism, 182.
- His insidious views in pressing the adoption of the Gallican declaration, 198 to 200.
- Sympathizes with & encourages Blanchard and the still more violent Gaschet, 201.
- His excessive anti-papacy, 201.
- His infidelity of translation, 205.
- Assimilates the power of the Supreme Bishop to that of our Speaker, Mr. Charles Abbott, 205, 6, 319.
- Unfaithful in translating, even his own latin profession of submission to papal power, 208. Appendix, VII.
- Outruns the malice of his employers, 209 to 211.
- Traduces his countrymen, 211.
- His fulsome and inconsistent praise of the English, 209 to 215, 226.
- Insults the religion of his country, 218 to 223, 228.
- Compares the Calvinism of Usher with the doctrine of the present Irish hierarchy, 219.
- His still grosser historical infidelities, 219 to 223.
- Denies any foreign (i.e. Papal) jurisdiction, Ibid.
- Applies the deistical sneer of a foreign officer to his own countrymen, 228.
- Announces his history or his memoirs, 229 to 233.
- Makes treacherous use of the historical documents in his hands 236, 7.
- Violently attacks and charges with falsehood his Grandfather and Dr. Curry, 240 to 243.
- Charges his countrymen with going through a 2nd edition of the massacre of St. Barthelemy, 243.
- Charges the opponents of Veto with the most scandalous and slanderous motives, 244, 5.
- Attempts to engage some Statesman to support the Veto, 246, 343, 4.
- Sides with the Intolerants against his country and her religion, 254.
- Confounds order and jurisdiction, 260.
- Forges an assertion for Dr. Poynter, on which he affects to rest his orthodoxy, 262, 3.
- His general confusion of terms, 274, 5.
- His Jansenian craft in declining to deny or admit a supremacy of jurisdiction in the Pope, 276.
- His arrogant assumptions and errors about the Civil Magistrate, 288 to 294.
- Misquotes Grötius, 255, 6.
- Debases the power of Sovereign Pontiff, 294 to 300.
- Fraudulent in suppressing facts concerning Papal Supremacy in Ireland, 302.
- Ditto, in suggesting that the Gallican declaration was made against the jurisdiction of the Pope, Ibid.

- Maintains against the Scotch, that jurisdiction depends only on the will of the superior, 312.
- Charged with schismatical intentions, 312, 13.
- Attempts to take unfair advantage of Fleury, 313.
- Errs grossly concerning divine right of Bishops and Priests, 313 to 319.
- Modestly assimilates himself to St. Jerome, 322, 343, 4.
- Has the true cant and puff of all reformers, Ibid.
- More striking antithesis of Grandfather and Grandson, 323 to 325
- Assimilated to Peter Walsh, 324.—Appendix, No. III.
- Represses his zeal for near thirty years against abuses, 328.
- His further errors about the Pope and the hierarchy, 322 to 330
- The Zebedean canvas for Elphin proved from the sacred text to be antichristian 328 to 330.
- His trick in professing one submission to the Pope in Latin, another in English, 330 to 333.
- His Latin and his English act of submission to Papal authority, with observations.—Appendix, No. VII. 95 to 99.
- Boasts of his extensive reading, 333.
- Misrepresents the system of coadjutorships, 333.
- Coarsely and wickedly abuses his hierarchy, 333 to 336.
- The actual motives for Columbanus' opposition to coadjutorships, 336 to 340.
- Calls Dr. Milners publication, an oglio and dab. and grossly abuses it, 341, 2.
- His charge against and pallinodia in favor of Sir J. C. Hip- pesley, 344, 5.
- He misquotes his own words, 345.
- Sets and plies Sir J. C. Hippesley on Veto, 346.
- Gives instances of many Irish Bishops appointed by the Pope without diocesan postulation, 341 to 357.
- Called upon to retract according to his promise, 367.
- An Alumnus or free Scholar at Rome on a Papal foundation.— Appendix 7.
- Takes the Ludovisian Oath, ditto, 8.
- The motives for his being graduated, 9.
- Subjects the Church to the Civil Magistrate, 10.
- Foiled in his views of a mitre; he publishes his unsound works, 11.
- Flatters his Patron, deceives the Pope, 12.
- Upbraids his countrymen with ignorance of their religion, 14, 15.
- Charges the Bishops with treason for having taken the Oath of Consecration, 15, 16
- Misrepresents the Gallican declaration as if made against the Pope, 16.
- Upbraids the Irish Catholics with not minding ordinary oaths, 16, 17.
- Accuses the Catholic Church of Ireland with being Mahome- dan, 17, 18.
- Refuses to return to his mission, 18, 9.
- Interrogates Dr. Bodkin about the costs of suit in a Roman court, and is himself interrogated upon ditto, 18, 19.
- Refers to Latin and English Works never published, 19.
- Has not yet given to the public any one of his long promised Works. Quer. if on account of his imperfect knowledge of the ancient Irish, according to Dr. Mc. Dermott? 21.

- Once took the popular side, but now he mentions his conversion, 22, 3.
- After failure of the canvas for Elphin in *terrorem Romæ* he holds it unnecessary to apply to the Pope for Episcopal jurisdiction, 24, 5.
- Charges Cath. Bishops with encouraging pretended miracles, 25.
- Denies Supreme jurisdiction to the Pope, 26.
- Denies that he is a judge to decide controversies in the Church, 26, 7.
- Insists that the Council of Trent never was accepted either as to discipline or doctrine by the Gallican church 29 to 37.
- Inadvertently stumbles into truth.—Appendix, 4.
- His false and insidious assertion, that Priests must be, but there needs not to be a Bishop in Synod. Appendix, 45.
- His rapid progress into consequence, and specimens of his sublime eloquence. Appendix, 49 to 52.
- Proofs of his cooperating with Mr. Butler, 528.
- Orange influence of Administration in 1803, 44.
- Institution renewed; their Oath of Allegiance only conditional; reports of their having Committees of the Duke of York, in which they swore men, 354, 5.
- Orders, Religious, how they exist in the Church, 326.
- Order, Sacrament of Holy, different from jurisdiction, 259, 260.
- Ormond, Duke of, spirit of his days, 74.
- No Irishman, but born in Clerkenwell, 78.
- Compared to Marquis of Buckingham, 79.
- Described as a bigot, 80.
- His restless spirit. 81.
- His sanguinary disposition proved from Protestant Authors, 86.
- Thwarts the King's wish for peace, 84.
- Might have saved the Monarchy, had he obeyed the King, 86.
- A real enemy of Ireland, 90.
- His canting and ranting Letter to Lord Gormanstown his old friend 92, 3.
- Benefits by the rebellion, 94, 5, 6.
- Solicits the Lords Justices to extend his field and powers of extermination, 97, 8.
- Intrigues with the Parliamentarians, 99 to 106.
- Admits his Machiavelism to Lord Digby, 104.
- His reluctance to obey the King, 106.
- His sympathies with the Scotch Rebels, 107.
- Acknowledges, when too late, the inflexible loyalty of the Catholics, 109.
- Owens his own degraded submission to the Parliamentarians, 111.
- His Machiavelianism boasted of. Ibid.
- Abuses his power of granting places and commissions to Catholics, 111 to 115.
- Like Strafford, 210.
- Helps Clarendon to write his Historical Review of the Affairs of Ireland, 242.
- List of the lands he gained in consequence of the rebellion. Appendix, No. I.
- Ossory, Lord, reports horrible cruelties of Inchiquin to Ormond, 90, 91.
- P
- Pachal, a noted Jansenist panegyricized by Mr. Jos. Berrington, 29.

Patrick, St. cotemporary with and holds same doctrines with St. Athanasius about the jurisdictional authority of the Pope, 304.

Pitt, Mr. prevalence given to his system, by the manœuvre of Marquis of Buckingham, 15.

Lets out Pandora's box on the nation, 17:

Pius VI. Pope, 200

VII. his duty to his flock in France, 201:

Plessis Bishop of Quebec how appointed.—Appendix, VIII. 170

His pastoral on the Popes captivity, Ibid.

Ponsonby, Honourable George misled and deceived about Veto, and abandons his defence of it, 247 to 254, 346, 7.

Pope, Jansenists antipathy to, 167.

The repository of Spiritual jurisdiction, 224.

Catholic doctrine of his supremacy as published in the Author's Church and State in 1795, 255,

Proved from Law cases, that our ancestors allowed his Holiness uncontrollable authority to appoint Bishops, 266 to 170.

Columbanus' erroneous opinions about him, 294 to 298.

Honorable judgment of 30 French Prelates upon his power as Vicar of Christ.—Appendix, 32.

All Supremacy denied him by Walsh, 301.

His jurisdictional authority in 4th century, 303.

His jurisdiction recognized by the Council of Florence, 320.

Ditto, very expressly by St. Jerome, 322.

Can appoint valid Bishops without Diocesan postulation, 341 357.

Can appoint coadjutors discretionally, 358.

Can lose none of his divine rights as successor of St. Peter, nor acquire any addition to them from the Civil Magistrate, 359, 360.

His Spiritual character affects not his civil rights or duties 360.

His indispensable duty to provide proper Bishops for the dispersed Churches, 360, 1.

Upon what grounds occasionally called upon to appoint coadjutors, 362.

Cannot as Vicar of Christ give Episopal juresdiction to a person he knows to be unfit, however named, elected, postulated or recommended, 361, 2.

Concienious motives for appointing coadjutors, 366.

Nature of Papal Bulls or grants, which mention temporalities, 364 to 367.

Port-Royal, the paladium of Jansenism at Paris, 207.

Power, vide Civil and Spiritual.

Poynter, Right Rev. Doctor Vicar Apostolic of the London district, what expected at his hands, 263 to 265.

Charged by Columbanus with what he never said, 36.

Prelates, vide Bishops.

Press, liberty of favorable to cotemporary history. Preface, X:

Its effects, 1.

Protestation, a formal disclaimer of many obnoxious doctrines imputed to the English Roman Catholics signed by 1583.—App. 55.

Protesting Catholic Dissenters, their co-operation with Columbanus, 148.

Q

Quesnel the Jansenist, some account of his condemned Works, 167.

Queonelism, real Calvinism according to Lafitau, Bishop of Sisteron. Appendix, 47.

R

- Redesdale, Lord**, intimate with Mr. Butler, 347:
 Gives to the House of Lords in 1805, similar assurances of a general spirit of Anti-prelacy amongst the Irish Catholics, as Sir John Cox Hipplesey did in 1812, 347, 8.
- Remonstrance**, Walsh right in it.—Appendix 14.
 The Remonstrance. Appendix, No. IX.
- Resolution**, the famous 5th settled by the Agent of the Board of British Catholics with Lords Grey and Grenville 249.
- Richer**, Walsh's most Catholic and learned divine, some account of his life and doctrines. Appendix, 42 to 46.
 His followers to be guarded against in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries. Appendix, 46.
 Termed an illustrious divine by Walsh, 302.
- Rolland**, a noted Jansenist (even in 1781) complains of having been disinherited by his Uncle's donations to the stock purse, notwithstanding he had expended 60,000 livres in procuring the abolition of the Jesuits. Appendix, 38.

S

- Saint Cyran**, Abbe, founder of Jansenism in France. Appendix, 28.
 His objections to the Council of Trent, Ibid.
- Schism**, Irish Catholics three centuries without, 145.
 Danger of from English Protestant Catholic Dissenters, 150.
 France involved in schism by the civil constitution of the clergy, 163.
 Similar danger to Ireland, 163, 4.
 Who Schismatics, according to St. Bernard, 306.
- Schismatical views** of blue books, and of Columbanus, 149.
- Sebaste**, Jansenistical Archbishop of, in Holland. Appendix, 39.
- Sidmouth**, Lord Viscount, the Author's proposal to him and views for writing Irish History, 9.
- Spalatro**, Archbishop of, some account of his defection and deprecated retractions. Appendix, 43.
- Spiritual Power**, nature of the Acts collating it, 270.
- Statute**, 50th Geo. III. Prison Act, which provides for Catholic Chaplains, 157.
- Strafford**, Earl of, his duplicity imitated by Ormond, and outdone by Columbanus, 210, 11.
- Supremacy**, Oath of, unlawful for a Catholic to take, 144, 147.
 Lord Grenville judges fairly of it, 147.
 Rev. Joseph Berrington encourages Catholics to take it, 149.
 Recommended by some bold men, as the Jansenists took the test of Innocent X. Appendix, 33.
 Any denied to the Pope by Walsh, 301.
- Synod and Synodical**, Act of the English Vicars Apostolic, 175.
 Acts of the Irish Bishops at Tullow, 178, and Appendix, No. V.

T

- Temple**, Sir John, intrigues with Ormond, 99.
 His character from Protestant Authors, 100.
- Temporal or civil power**, quod vide.
- Tencin**, Cardinal, how represented by Columbanus, 169
- Thomassin** vouches for Coadjutorships being usual in the Church from the very earliest times, 364.
 Commended by Columbanus as prime authority, Ibid.
- Truth**, the resort to, and abuse of it by Columbanus, 6 to 8.

Tulley, Synodical resolutions of, 178. Appendix, No. V.

U

Unigenitus Bull, the test for discovering a Jansenist, 169.

V

Veto, objected to by Charles O'Connor 50 years before the term used, 239.

Urged strongly by Columbanus, 243, 4, 5.

Effects of State influence upon it, 347.

Renounced by Lords Grey and Grenville, and Messrs. Ponsonby and Grattan, 247 to 254.

This and arrangements in contemplation of Sir John Cox Hippley, as early as 1796, 340, 1.

Vicars Apostolic, English, their Synodical Resolutions about Blanchardists, 175.

Their Encyclical Letter, condemning the Oath of the would-be protesting Catholic Dissenters. Appendix, 55, 6.

W

Wales, Prince of, his flattering acceptance of the Author's history. Pref. IX.

Taken in by the Marquis of Buckingham's manœuvre, to vote against his father, 16.

Unconstitutional restrictions of the Regent, 19.

Walsh, Rev. Father Peter rises against his superiors, and broaches unsound doctrines, 147.

His Antipapal doctrines referred to, 149.

Parallel between him and Columbanus. Appendix, No. III. 7.

Subjects the Church to civil Magistrate, 10.

Foiled in his pursuit of a mitre, he gives into unsound doctrines, 11.

Flatters his Patron, decries the Pope, 12.

Right in his remonstrance, and therefore on that score wrongly excommunicated, 13, 14.

Punished for other matters, 14.

Upbraids the rest with ignorance of their religion, 14, 5.

Charges the Bishops with treason for having taken the Consecration Oath, 14, 5.

Misrepresents the Gallican declaration as if made against the Pope, 16.

Upbraids the Irish Catholics with not minding ordinary Oaths, 16, 7.

Accuses the Catholic Church of Ireland with being Mahomedan, 17, 18.

Refuses to return to his convent, 18, 9.

Refers his readers to Latin and English Works never published, 19.

Gave not to the public his promised Work. Quære if on account of his ignorance of the ancient Irish, according to Dr. Nicholson? 21.

Once a furious confederate, but no where alludes to his conversion, 22, 3.

After he had failed in his views upon the See of Dublin, he set up his remonstrance, and wrote to terrify Rome, 24.

Charges the Catholic Irish Clergy with encouraging counterfeit miracles, 25.

Denies supreme jurisdiction to the Pope, 26.

Denies, that he is a judge to decide controversies in the Church, 26, 27.

Abuses and rejects the authority of the Council of Trent, 29 to 37.

Denies any supremacy in Pope, 301.

Whitaker, Rev. Mr. a respectable Protestant divine, commends Lesley, as next to St. Paul, 286.

INDEX

IV

Writings of, his historical acceptance of the Author, history, Preface, IX.
 Taken in by the Marquis of Buckingham, manuscript, in this
 against his father, 46.
 Unconventional reception of the Legend, 19.
 Walsh, Rev. Father, for his against his supporters, and, brother, was
 sound doctrine, 141.
 The Antiquary, doctrine referred to, 140.
 Relationship between him and Columbanus, Appendix, No. III. 7.
 Subject the Church to civil discipline, 10.
 Took in his pursuit of a more, he gives into unsonant doctrine, 11.
 Thinks his Patron, deserves the Pope, 12.
 Right in his remonstrance, and therefore on that score wrongly
 excommunicated, 12, 14.
 Punished for other matters, 14.
 Upholds the rest with ignorance of their religion, 14, 5.
 Charges the Bishop, with treason for having taken the Consecration
 of Oath, 14, 5.
 Misrepresents the Gallican declaration as it made against the
 Pope, 16.
 Upholds the Irish Catholics with not understanding ordinary Oath, 16, 7.
 and Attacks the Catholic Church of Ireland with being Mahomedan,
 17, 18.
 Refuses to return to his canon, 18, 9.
 Hears his teachers to Latin and English Works never published, 19.
 Gave not to the public his promised Work, Quote it on account of
 his ignorance of the ancient Irish, according to Dr. Nicholson.
 Once a furious confederate, but no where alludes to his conversion,
 22, 3.
 After he had failed in his views upon the Sec of Dublin, he set up
 his remonstrance, and wrote to Mr. Henry Home, 24.
 Charges the Catholic Irish clergy with encouraging confederate
 ministers, 25.
 Denies supposing jurisdiction to the Pope, 26.
 Decides, that he is a judge to decide controversies in the Church, 26.
 27.
 Attacks and rejects the authority of the Council of Trent, 29 to 37.
 Denies any supremacy in Rome, 30.
 Withers, Rev. Mr. a respectable Protestant divine, commands Lesley, as
 next to St Paul, 388.
 Writings of, his historical acceptance of the Author, history, Preface, IX.
 Taken in by the Marquis of Buckingham, manuscript, in this
 against his father, 46.
 Unconventional reception of the Legend, 19.
 Walsh, Rev. Father, for his against his supporters, and, brother, was
 sound doctrine, 141.
 The Antiquary, doctrine referred to, 140.
 Relationship between him and Columbanus, Appendix, No. III. 7.
 Subject the Church to civil discipline, 10.
 Took in his pursuit of a more, he gives into unsonant doctrine, 11.
 Thinks his Patron, deserves the Pope, 12.
 Right in his remonstrance, and therefore on that score wrongly
 excommunicated, 12, 14.
 Punished for other matters, 14.
 Upholds the rest with ignorance of their religion, 14, 5.
 Charges the Bishop, with treason for having taken the Consecration
 of Oath, 14, 5.
 Misrepresents the Gallican declaration as it made against the
 Pope, 16.
 Upholds the Irish Catholics with not understanding ordinary Oath, 16, 7.
 and Attacks the Catholic Church of Ireland with being Mahomedan,
 17, 18.
 Refuses to return to his canon, 18, 9.
 Hears his teachers to Latin and English Works never published, 19.
 Gave not to the public his promised Work, Quote it on account of
 his ignorance of the ancient Irish, according to Dr. Nicholson.
 Once a furious confederate, but no where alludes to his conversion,
 22, 3.
 After he had failed in his views upon the Sec of Dublin, he set up
 his remonstrance, and wrote to Mr. Henry Home, 24.
 Charges the Catholic Irish clergy with encouraging confederate
 ministers, 25.
 Denies supposing jurisdiction to the Pope, 26.
 Decides, that he is a judge to decide controversies in the Church, 26.
 27.
 Attacks and rejects the authority of the Council of Trent, 29 to 37.
 Denies any supremacy in Rome, 30.
 Withers, Rev. Mr. a respectable Protestant divine, commands Lesley, as
 next to St Paul, 388.

FINIS


ERRATA.

PAGE.	LINE.	
X	—	Marginal Note, For people <i>read</i> press.
1	— 5	For stilling — styling.
6	— 30	For John — Peter.
20	— 4	For same — some.
30	— 28	For orinals — originals.
100	— 2	Before the word <i>repeated</i> insert <i>Ormond</i> .
115	— 15	For særo <i>read</i> sacro.
168	— 15	For and — said.
179	—	Last Note For 1 Col. — <i>antea</i> .
194	— 33	At the blank insert <i>too</i> .
203	— 10	For highly <i>read</i> lightly.
205	— 4	For by — of.
207	— 17	For Apostolos — Apostolis.
211	— 30	For July — February
214	— 16	For national — metrical
298	— 22	Before Sacraments <i>insert</i> of
309	— 30	Transpose the word <i>with</i> to the preceding line after the word <i>dispense</i> .
337	— 6	For enlightened <i>read</i> enlightened
335	— 19	For 1432 — 432
341	— 2	For civil — spiritual

APPENDIX.

PAGE.	LINE.	
30	— 28	For Verteger <i>read</i> Verger.
42	— 6	For decree — degree.
43	— 15	For Francis — Father
44	— 21	For Ame — Anne.
48	— 7	After <i>resorted</i> add <i>to</i> .
108	— 21	For cloath <i>read</i> cloth.





Plowden, Francis

An historical letter to Charles O'Conor heretofore styling himself
Columbanus upon his 5 Adresses or letters to his Countrymen

S.l. 1812

Brit. 433 g

urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10281324-0